DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 459 SP 003 456

TITLE	IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION COURSE: TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING. AN EVALUATION REPORT.
INSTITUTION	NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIV., DURHAM. BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TESTING SERVICES.
PUB DATE	OCT 69
NOTE	108P.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.60
DESCRIPTORS	*ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, *INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, *INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION, *READING INSTRUCTION, *REGIONAL PROGRAMS, RURAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS, TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

ABSTRACT

THE TELEVISION COURSE, "TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING," REPRESENTS THE THIRD IN A SERIES OF INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS DEVELOPED AND PRODUCED BY THE NEW HAMPSHIRE NETWORK TO IMPROVE THE PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS OF TEACHERS PREVIOUSLY ISOLATED BY GEOGRAPHIC BARRIERS CHARACTERISTIC OF THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT OF NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND. THE INFORMATION PRESENTED IN THIS DOCUMENT, THE EXTENSIVE FORMAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM, IS ORGANIZED ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING FIVE-FOLD FORMAT: (1) THE BIOGRAPHICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHER-ENROLLEES; (2) THE ASSESSMENT OF TARGETED PROCESS INFORMATION INCLUDING ENROLLEE ASSESSMENT OF THE 15-LESSON INSTRUCTIONAL SERIES, GENERALLY, AND THE RELATED TELEVISION LESSONS, STUDY GUIDE, REGIONAL WORK SESSIONS, AND CLASSROOM FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES; (3) THE CHANGE DATA REPRESENTED BY PRE- POST INSTRUMENT ADMINISTRATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF ON-GOING DATA INPUT; (4) THE RESULTS OF A FINAL "RETROSPECTIVE" COURSE EVALUATION; AND (5) A SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT EFFORT WITH EMPHASIS ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION COURSES FOR REGIONAL EDUCATION, INCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS OF PLAUSIBLE CHANGES IN DESIGN, DOCUMENTATION, PRODUCTION, AND EVALUATIVE SEGMENTS OF THE READING COURSE. AMONG THE MAJOR NEEDS UNDERLINED BY THE STUDY IS THE NEED FOR A THOROUGH REEXAMINATION OF THE UNDERLYING CONCEPT OF INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION. (AUTHOR/JES)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED036459

SP003456

An Evaluation Report

IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION COURSE:
TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING

NEW HAMPSHIRE NETWORK
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

in cooperation with

New Hampshire State Department of Education
Title I ESEA

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,
Title I, P.L. 89-10, as amended

A Formal Evaluation Report Prepared By

Bureau of Educational Research
and Testing Services
Department of Education
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

October 1969

The television course--TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING--and associated materials have been produced persuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the New Hampshire State Department of Education to the New Hampshire Network, Durham, New Hampshire under provisions of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, as amended).

However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Office of Education or the New Hampshire State Department of Education and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education or the New Hampshire State Department of Education should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On behalf of the Bureau of Educational Research and Testing Services, I would like to express our appreciation to several members of the project team for their time, cooperation, and patience during both the planning and evaluative phases of this project: William Brady, Director of Instructional Services at WENH-TV/New Hampshire Network, Durham; Dr. Roselmina Indrisano, Reading Specialist and Professor, Department of Education at the University of New Hampshire, Durham (now at the Boston University); Mary Pine, Department of Education at the University of New Hampshire, Durham; the twenty-one regional consultants who coordinated workshop programs; and the 633 teacher-enrollees who actively participated in the instructional program.

I am especially grateful to three skilled friends whose time and efforts permitted the collation of volumes of descriptive and statistical data associated with the evaluation: Patricia (Pat) McCarthy, fifth-grade teacher at the Oyster River Elementary School, Durham, who ultimately survived many "hours of pure, unadulterated torture" in organizing and tabulating 611 sets of questionnaire and checklist documents on the biographical characteristics and professional expectations of the teacher-enrollees; and Bob Hart and Bob Zelonis of the Bureau operations team whose programming and data processing skills permitted the extensive computer processing of nearly 15,000 evaluative documents during the period of performance of the project. Their combined efforts contributed significantly to the comprehensive assessment and successful completion of this evaluation effort.

Finally, may we express our gratitude to the New Hampshire Supervisory Union #21, the personnel of WENH-TV/New Hampshire Network, the New Hampshire State Department of Education, and the U.S. Office of Education for sponsoring and supporting this innovative and regionally important educational program.

Albert R. Elwell, Coordinator
WENH-TV Reading Project R & D
Bureau of Educational Research
and Testing Services, U.N.H.

INDEX

Contents — Page

Introduction 1

- History of the Innovative Series 1
- Evaluative Report Format 2

Section I--Characteristics of the Enrollee 3

- Enrollments By Center 3
- The Forty-Two Year Old Teacher 4
- Professional-Academic Achievement 6
- Undergraduate Degree-Granting Institution: an indication of teacher mobility 6
- Graduate Level Academic Preparation 8
- Characteristics of the Enrollees' Classroom Environment 10
- Curriculum Guide in Reading Instruction 11
- Professional Reading Personnel 13
- Reading/Language Arts Materials and Media 17
- Phased Entry Programs Into the School Reading Program 19
- Additional Characteristics of the Elementary Reading Instructional Program 20
- Enrollee Rationale for Participating in Title I Course 21

Section II--Assessment of Targeted Process Information 25

- Introduction 25
- The Television Lesson 26
- The Study Guide 27
- The Work Session 29
- The Classroom Follow-Up 30
- Over-all Lesson Evaluation 31
- Comparative Data on Instructional Segments 32

Section III--Assessment of Pre-Post Test Data and Subjective Staff Evaluations 35

- Pre-Course Differential Skills 35
- Pre-Post Review Test Administration 37
- Evaluation of Participant and Regional Instructor 37
  - Response-Teacher Participants
  - Response-Regional Instructors

INDEX (Cont.)

Contents	Page
Section IV--Assessment of Final Course Evaluation Data	40
Assessment of Individual Televised Lessons	40
Assessment of General Response to Program	42
Section V--Summary and Implications	45

Table	Description	Page
I	Enrollment By Center	3
II	Comparative Enrollment Data: Art, Science and Reading Courses	4
III	Age (of Enrollees)	5
IV	Number of Years Teaching Experience	5
V	Cumulative Years At Specified Grade Level(s)	5
VI	Location of Undergraduate Degree-Granting Institution	7
VII	Undergraduate Courses in Reading	8
VIII	Post-Graduate Courses in Reading	9
IX	Number of Students in Self-Contained Classrooms	10
X	Number Hours Per Week of Scheduled Reading Instruction	10
XI	Length (in Time) of Each Reading Period	11
XII	Availability and Characteristics of Reading Curriculum Guide	12
XIII	Availability of Professional Reading Personnel in School System	
XIV	Consultative Environment of Teacher-Specialist Interaction	14
XV	Services Provided Classroom Teachers by Professional Reading Personnel	15
XVI	Teacher-Enrollee Perceived Needs for Reading Specialists Development	16
XVII	Primary Source Texts: by Types of Texts and Copyright Dates	17
XVIII	Availability and Use of Instructional Media in Reading	18
XIX	Type of Entry Program (pre-school/type)	19
XX	Methods of Grouping for Reading Instruction	20
XXI	Basic Approach(es) of the Instructional Program	20
XXII	Techniques of Diagnosis	20
XXIII	Reason for Enrolling in Title I Elementary Reading Workshop	22
XXIV	Single Most Important Reason for Enrolling in Course	23

INDEX (Cont.)

Table	Description	Page
XXV	Rank-Order of Statistics on the Television Lesson	27
XXVI	Rank-Order of Statistics on the Study Guide	28
XXVII	Rank-Order of Statistics on the Work Session	29
XXVIII	Rank-Order of Statistics on the Classroom Follow-Up	30
XXIX	Rank-Order of Statistics on the Total Course Evaluation	31
XXX	Comparative Mean Data: Average Score and Mean Value for Four Instructional Segments and Over-all Lesson Evaluation	32
XXXI	Average Rank of Lessons Over Four Program Segment Rankings	33
XXXII	Differential Levels of Pre-Course Preparation: Data by Regional Center and Total	36
XXXIII	Summary of Final Course Evaluation Data Related to Assessment of Individual Lessons	41
XXXIV	Summary of Final Course Evaluation Data on the General Inquiry Items	43

Formal Evaluation Report

In-Service Teacher Education Course: Teaching Elementary School Reading

INTRODUCTION

The television course--TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING--represents the third in a series of innovative instructional programs developed and produced by the New Hampshire Network for dissemination to elementary teachers in northern New England. Although the primary target audience for these in-service courses has been the elementary teacher in New Hampshire, the geographic area served by the New Hampshire Network has realistically permitted transmission of a professionally relevant in-service education series to a four-state audience including educators in Maine, Vermont, and Massachusetts as well as New Hampshire.

History of the Innovative Series

The first instructional program--ART FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS--was developed and implemented in 1966 and reproduced during the 1967-1968 academic year. SCIENCE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS was designed and disseminated in 1967-68. These highly successful art and science courses, supported with Title III ESEA funds, served as stimuli to the latest innovative effort assessed in this Report. Production costs for TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING were provided by the Title I ESEA Office of the New Hampshire State Department of Education.

The instructional format of the reading course was patterned after the earlier art and science programs and reached over six-hundred elementary teachers employed in four states through the combination of the television medium and correlated instructional workshops located at twenty-one regional centers in New Hampshire. In just two years, in-service teacher education courses produced by the New Hampshire Network have served 1282 elementary teachers in the region. In light of the historical record of teacher education and, especially, in-service education in northern New England reaching this number of educators must be viewed as a significant accomplishment and break-through toward improving the professional knowledge and skills of teachers previously isolated by geographic barriers characteristic of the rural environment of the region.

The evaluation design and associated materials employed in the evaluative effort relative to the reading course closely resembled previous assessments of the art and science programs. In fact, much of the material developed under the Title III studies was utilized for the present effort with modifications reflecting both the differential nature of course content and the lessons learned from the art and science courses.

Evaluative Report Format

Sources of evaluative data input represent several audiences associated with the project including the teacher-enrollees, the regional coordinators-instructors, the professional consultants who designed and documented the course format and associated materials, the New Hampshire Network production group, and the operational and research staff of the Bureau evaluation team. In all, over 650 individuals contributed input to the comprehensive assessment of the Title I reading course.

The basic format of this report can best be described as five-fold:

> Section I focuses on the biographical characteristics and professional expectations of the teacher-enrollees served by the project during the 1968-69 academic year;
>
> Section II reports the assessment of targeted process information including enrollee assessment of the fifteen-lesson instructional series, generally, and the related television lessons, the study guide, the regional work sessions, and the classroom follow-up activities;
>
> Section III documents change data represented by pre-post instrument administration and statistical analyses of ongoing data input including the reiteration of subjective narrative assessments of both enrollees' and regional instructors' perceptions of the course impact on professional growth;
>
> Section IV summarizes the results of a final course evaluation conducted by the New Hampshire Network relative to enrollees' "retrospective" assessment of their course experiences; and,
>
> Section V presents a global summary of the project effort with emphasis on the implications of in-service education courses for regional education including recommendations of plausible changes in the design, documentation, production, and evaluative segments of the reading course.

Finally, it should be noted that tabulated information may not always sum to the total population (633) of teacher-enrollees since only complete and valid documents were processed for analysis. The number of processed documents does, however, reflect the entire population, and it is assumed that replication of the analyses utilizing one-hundred per cent of the course population would not significantly alter the findings based on sample data as reported in this evaluative document.

SECTION I

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ENROLLEE

The Teacher Inventory, a basic biographical data questionnaire, was developed to assess the demographic, social, and professional characteristics of course enrollees. Additionally, several items of the Inventory were designed to yield information relative to the instructional environment (i.e., school and community) within which the teachers were employed, including the physical characteristics of their classrooms, the availability of professional consultants and specialists in reading, information relative to the materials and media utilized in their instructional programs, and items specific to their reasons for enrolling in the Title I course.

Enrollments By Center

Data in Table I indicate that the problem of variance in enrollment by regional center which had been a significant factor in the earlier art and science courses did not emerge as an administratively and instructionally relevant issue in the reading course. It might be assumed that experience gained through the earlier courses and the availability of qualified instructional consultants throughout the region permitted the selection of geographically representative centers responsive to enrollment projections.

Table I--Enrollment By Center

Center Code	Center	N	% Total	Center Code	Center	N	% Total
707	Ashland	31	4.9	724	Lebanon-Hanover	31	4.9
709	Berlin	27	4.3	726	Littleton	29	4.6
712	Claremont	33	5.2	727	Manchester #1	31	4.9
756	Dover #1	26	4.1	767	Manchester #2	28	4.4
757	Dover #2	30	4.7	729	Nashua	34	5.4
718	Farmington	30	4.7	733	Peterborough	30	4.7
719	Franklin	31	4.9	734	Portsmouth	30	4.7
744	Hampton	28	4.4	740	Salem #1	32	5.1
721	Hopkinton	32	5.1	741	Salem #2	30	4.7
759	Keene	33	5.2	738	Wolfeboro	29	4.6
723	Kittery	28	4.4				
					TOTAL*	633	

---

*Total enrollment N=633 represents participants for whom one or more valid evaluative instrument(s) were available following initial workshop session; only 611 valid Teacher Inventory questionnaires were received (96.5%) upon which enrollee characteristic data analyses were computed.

The significance of enrollment projection accuracy and its implication of probable enrollee satisfaction with the course has been a factor of concern to program administrators of the art, science, and reading courses. Extensive effort has been devoted to achieving a "balanced" enrollment across regional centers and to maintain a meaningful and functional enrollee-instructor ratio. An examination of comparative data in Table II reveals startling differences in enrollment data by regional center for the art, science, and reading programs and reflects apparent success in satisfactorily projecting enrollments for the current reading course. Some concern might be voiced, however, over the rising average enrollment by center and some thought should be given to the establishment of maximum enrollment criteria for future courses.

Table II--Comparative Enrollment Data:
Art, Science, and Reading Courses

Course	Total Enrollment	Number Centers	Center Low N	Center High N	Center Mean N
Art	332	13	14	32*	25.5
Science	317	16	16	29	19.8
Reading	633	21	26	34	30.1

*One center initially enrolled 55 teachers; resolved through employment of an additional instructor for that center.

The Forty-Two Year Old Teacher

In the 1967-68 art program report the biographical sketch of the "typical" elementary school teacher-enrollee was characterized as a female resident of New Hampshire, employed in a rural or small town school system, forty-two years of age with twelve years of teaching experience and enrolled in the course to improve her knowledge of the subject matter being presented in the course.

Examination of similar data parameters for the teacher-enrollee in the reading course revealed a near carbon-copy of the art teacher (indeed, many teachers who had enrolled in the art course subsequently enrolled in the present reading program). Age and employment history data noted below again support the earlier hypothesis that New Hampshire elementary teachers view teaching as a contingent rather than career occupation; that is, they tend to pursue teaching upon graduation from college, drop out of the profession to "raise children", and then return to the teaching arena when their children reach school age and remain in teaching for a number of years thereafter.

Summary data on the teacher-enrollee in the reading course indicate that the average teacher was still forty-two years of age but had served eleven (rather than twelve) years as an elementary teacher in New Hampshire schools.

Table III--Age

Age Range	N	% Total
21 - 27	143	23.4
28 - 37	113	18.5
38 - 47	107	17.5
48 - 57	145	23.7
58 - 67	102	16.7
68 +	1	0.2
	Total 611	Mean 41.7

Table IV--Number of Years Teaching Experience

# Years Teaching	N	% Total	# Years Teaching	N	% Total
No response	19	3.1	11 - 15	57	9.3
Beginning/One	90	14.7	16 - 20	67	11.0
Two	38	6.2	21 - 25	57	9.3
Three	44	7.2	26 - 30	33	5.4
Four	33	5.4	31 - 35	13	2.1
5 - 10	148	24.2	36 +	12	2.0
				Total 611	Mean 11.1

As it appears that many of the teacher-enrollees have taught at several levels (i.e. grades) during their tenure, the results of analyses of grade level experience may tend to be rather ambiguous. A meaningful analysis of each teacher's professional history would require a data base not readily available from questionnaire information. An examination of cumulative years at selected grade levels does, however, indicate the over-all professional history of the course population.

Table V--Cumulative Years at Specified Grade Level(s)

Grade Level	N	% Total	Grade Level	N	% Total
Primary (K - 3)	441	47.8	Junior High (7 - 8)	110	11.9
Intermediate (4-6)	315	34.1	Senior High (9 - 12)	57	6.2

The data presented in Table V seem to indicate considerable grade level mobility of the enrollee population. Although specific information was not available relative to their present grade level assignment it would be interesting to speculate the extent to which junior high and senior high school teachers were indeed enrolled in the reading course in an effort to gain knowledge and skills applicable to students at those grade levels.

Finally, several enrollees (N=75; 12.3%) had been or were now involved in administrative (33), guidance (2), department chairman (13), reading specialist (19), and reading consultant (2) roles at the time of the course. Five additional teachers carried multiple responsibilities (e.g., administrator and guidance director).

In summary, Teacher Inventory data seem to indicate that the reading course reached several target groups ranging from primary through senior high levels, teachers with a wide variance in experience, and instructional, administrative and special services personnel associated with the educational environment.

Professional-Academic Achievement

In the earlier art and science studies a major concern was the extent to which the teachers did not own an academic degree (i.e. undergraduate) from an accredited institution of teacher preparation. Of the 332 art teachers enrolled in the course, 174 (52.4%) either did not possess an academic degree or were employed on a provisional basis. Twenty-four per cent of the elementary science teachers had not completed a single academic course in any science-related curriculum area.

Teachers enrolled in the reading course, however, held a bachelor's degree (N=454; 73.3%), while 12.5% had completed either an associate or "normal school" program. Fourteen teacher-enrollees had not completed any college work or its equivalent, and seventy-four teachers (12.0%) did not respond to the inquiry item relative to undergraduate degree preparation.

Undergraduate Degree-Granting Institution: an indication of teacher mobility. The recently completed New England Assessment Study clearly indicated that teacher mobility is a significant problem in northern New England. Younger teachers graduating from New Hampshire teacher preparation institutions tend to leave the state for the excitement of urban areas and higher economic benefits. Many out-of-state teachers, on the other hand, are moving into the New Hampshire and Northern New England schools due to the recreational opportunities of the region. Additionally, the "non-tax" philosophy of New Hampshire's legislature has drawn many teachers across New Hampshire's borders, especially from neighboring Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont, as an escape from those states' taxation policies in recent years.

As an indication of teacher mobility into New Hampshire's schools and institutions of higher education, it is of some interest to note that 206 of the enrollees had received their undergraduate preparation from institutions outside New Hampshire.* This 33.7% figure compares favorably with the teachers (N=284; 46.5%) who had received their training in New Hampshire institutions of higher education.

Table VI--Location of Undergraduate Degree-Granting Institution

Out-of-State (by State)	N	% Total	New Hampshire (by institution)	N	% Total
California	1		Keene State	113	18.5
Canada	2		Mount St. Mary's	14	
Colorado	1		Nathanial Hawthorne	1	
Connecticut	9		New England College	3	
District (D.C.)	1		Plymouth State	82	13.4
Illinois	2		Rivier College	7	
Indiana	1		St. Anslem's	1	
Louisiana	1		U.N.H. (Durham)	63	10.3
Maine	42	6.9			
Maryland	4		(No Response or Other)	121	19.8
Massachusetts	89	14.6			
Michigan	4				
Mississippi	1				
Missouri	1				
Nebraska	1				
New Jersey	1				
New York	13				
Puerto Rico	1				
Rhode Island	4				
Texas	1				
Vermont	22	3.6%			
(Unidentifiable)	4				
% Total	206	33.7%	N.H. % of Total	284	46.5%

To complete the descriptive segment on the enrollees' undergraduate preperation in reading the data in Table VII indicate an appraisal of the number of undergraduate courses in reading previously taken by the teachers. Thirty-seven per cent of the enrollees did not respond to the item and, therefore, caution must be voiced in interpreting these data.

---

*It is acknowledged that a large segment of enrollees tabulated as out-of-state may indeed be employed in the bordering states of Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont. The fact remains, however, that a significant percentage of enrollees "crossed borders" either subsequent to acquiring their undergraduate degree or to enroll in the present reading course.

Table VII--Undergraduate Courses in Reading

# Reading Courses	N	% Total
No Response	225	36.8
All "Required" Courses	17	2.8
None	46	7.5
One	135	22.1
Two	119	19.5
Three	47	7.7
Four	19	3.1
Five or More	3	0.5

It seems plausible to assume that most teachers responding "cannot remember (tabulated as "No Response" above) had probably completed the minimum number of reading courses, at best, or none at all. If such an assumption is correct, over sixty-nine per cent of the enrolled teachers had completed no more than one undergraduate course in reading. Also, reiterating the age-experience factors previously reported, it seems equally plausible to assume that most teachers who had completed a reading program had received this training prior to 1960 and, therefore, were severely "outdated" insofar as contemporary reading techniques and practices were concerned. Thus, in most cases the reading program sponsored by the New Hampshire Network was perhaps the first contact with modern instructional techniques and constituted a retraining program for elementary teachers in the New Hampshire region.

Graduate Level Academic Preparation. Of major significance is that only forty-one teacher-enrollees held a graduate degree at the time they were enrolled in the reading course. Nineteen of these teachers had acquired their graduate degree from New Hampshire institutions (46.3%) while the remaining group (53.7%) completed their graduate degree requirements at out-of-state institutions. In short, ONLY SEVEN PER CENT OF THE TEACHER POPULATION ENROLLED IN THE READING COURSE HAD RECEIVED A GRADUATE DEGREE PRIOR TO THE TITLE I EXPERIENCE. These data compare with ten percent of the teachers enrolled in the art program and five per cent of the teachers who had completed the elementary science course in 1968. These data again suggest that New Hampshire teachers lack an orientation toward professional advancement via an advanced degree program as noted in both the art and science evaluation reports.

Again, what may on the surface appear to be a lack of orientation and/or motivation toward professional advancement is explained--at least in part--by a combination of several factors characteristic of the New Hampshire region: (a) data from age and teaching experience suggest that the majority of enrollees held a minimum number of academic credits required for certification in New Hampshire, and many held only provisional certificates acquired from regional "normal school" teacher preparation programs; (b) it is generally not considered economically feasible to pursue either a bachelor's or advanced degree due to the factors of age ($\bar{X}$=42), professional tenure ($\bar{X}$=11 years), and the very liberal teacher certification requirements of the State of New Hampshire in light of its severe teacher supply-demand problems; (c) to formally pursue either a bachelor's degree or graduate study in New Hampshire is an extremely difficult proposition at best that would require considerable travel over long distances to regional institutions of higher education, time to complete formal requirements, and typically excessive tuition expense that most often is not reimbursed by local school systems (partial recovery of outlay is, at best, a dream and not a reality in New Hampshire educational history). Thus, most New Hampshire teachers are content to pursue their roles without too much concern for certification and advance degree requirements and to retire in their respective rural communities.

Most elementary teachers in the region pursue knowledge concerning innovative techniques and materials, but they choose to gain this knowledge on a personal rather than reward-oriented basis. Less than one-quarter of the teacher-enrollees had completed graduate level courses in reading prior to the Title I course. Data in Table VIII appear to support the hypothesis that most teachers either do not pursue advanced study at all or confine their graduate activities to specific instructional-area courses, such as reading.

Table VIII--Post Graduate Courses in Reading

# Graduate Courses	N	% Total
No Response/None	443	72.5
One	96	15.7
Two	44	7.2
Three	18	2.9
Four	5	0.8
Five or More	5	0.8

Finally, it can be assumed that most of the teacher-enrollees who had completed two or more graduate level courses in reading were among those teachers who had completed graduate study (N=41) or who, by the professional requirements of their current role, had been required to complete advanced study (e.g., specialists and reading consultants, etc.; N=75).

Characteristics of the Enrollees' Classroom Environment

Several Teacher Inventory items were designed to reveal the general characteristics of the teacher-enrollee's classroom and to focus specifically on the nature of the reading program presented in their school system. Primary evaluative emphasis was placed on the self-contained classroom environment and the implications of this environment for reading instruction.

Of the 611 teachers enrolled in the reading course 443 (72.5) worked in self-contained classrooms. These teachers were asked to document three additional items of probable significance: (a) the number of students in their class, (b) the number of hours per week scheduled for reading instruction, and (c) the length of time of each reading period. Summary data for these items are noted below.

Table IX--Number of Students in Self-Contained Classrooms

# Students	N	# Total	# Students	N	# Total
No Response	2	0.4	27 - 32	119	26.9
1 - 14	18	4.1	33 - 38	23	5.2
15 - 20	82	18.5	39 - 44	7	1.6
21 - 26	189	42.7	45 or more	3	0.7
			Total	443	
			Mean	23.8	

Table X--Number Hours Per Week of Scheduled Reading Instruction

# Hours	N	# Total	# Hours	N	# Total
Under 1	23	5.2	8	17	3.8
1	4	0.9	9	6	1.4
2	14	3.2	10	105	23.7
3	17	3.8	11	10	2.3
4	8	1.8	12	34	7.7
5	76	17.2	13	4	0.9
6	23	5.2	14	3	0.7
7	54	12.2	15+	45	10.2
			Total	443	
			Mean	8.0	

Table XI--Length of Time of Each Reading Period

Period (in minutes)	N	% Total
No Response	24	5.4
1 - 30 min.	249	56.2
31 - 60 min.	109	24.6
61 - 90 min.	48	10.8
91 min. or more	13	2.9
Total	443	

Approximate Mean 35.7 minutes

Data in Tables IX-XI suggest that the average number of students in the elementary classroom is expanding rapidly and presents some real concern for teachers and administrators relative to the development and maintenance of effective instructional programs in reading. The typical classroom enrollment may consist of eighteen to thirty students whose reading instruction is condensed into eight hours per week in half-hour blocks. Such scheduling parameters appear to place some significant constraints on the development of an adequate reading program. This problem receives some additional negative support when one considers the professional preparation characteristics of the typical rural New Hampshire elementary teacher in the area of reading instruction and the diagnosis of reading difficulties. Further bases for this concern are revealed through the examination of evaluative data relative to the nature of the instructional media and materials available to the elementary teacher in New Hampshire.

Curriculum Guide in Reading Instruction. A series of Inventory items assessed the extent to which the teacher-enrollees had available in their schools a curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts for use in their instructional programs. Additional items probed the apparent development and/or revision of an available guide including the degree to which the teacher was directly involved in its development and/or revision; the extent to which the teachers were required to follow the guide utilized in their school systems; and, the teachers' perceptions of the need for further revision of the existing guide in their system.

Table XII includes summary data on the above inquiries. It should be noted that questions (b), (c), and (d) include response data based only on those teachers who indicated in (a) that their school had a curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts.

Table XII--Availability and Characteristics of Reading Curriculum Guide

Inquiry Statements	Response Modes	N	% Responding
(a) Does your school have a curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts for the grade(s) you teach?	No Response	49	----
	Yes	284	50.5
	No	278	49.5
(b) Did you participate in the development and/or revision of this guide?	No Response	123	---
	Yes	86	17.6
	No	402	82.4
(c) Are you required to follow this guide with your reading classes at the grade level(s) you teach?	No Response	138	----
	Yes	149	31.5
	No	324	68.5
(d) Do you feel that this guide needs further revision at the grade level(s) you teach?	No Response	209	----
	Yes	146	36.3
	No	256	63.7

Only one-half of the schools represented by the teacher-enrolleed had developed a curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts. The most startling data, however, are reflected in the extent to which teacher participation in the development and/or revision of the guide was realized at the local level. LESS THAN ONE-FIFTH OF THE TEACHER-ENROLLEES HAD PARTICIPATED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CURRICULUM GUIDE IN READING APPLICABLE TO THEIR GRADE LEVEL. Yet, thirty-two per cent of the teachers reported that they were required to follow their school system's curriculum guide with their reading classes. Most disturbing, however, is that slightly over one-third of the teacher-enrollees felt that their school's curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts needed further revision.

It is perhaps safe to assume that the majority of school systems represented by the enrollees adopt a curriculum guide prepared by a national publisher. Still, one-half of the schools represented did not have either a nationally or locally developed curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts in their instructional materials. Given the apparent level of professional competence in curriculum development, it is not surprising to find some degree of either ignorance or apathy relative to the use of a curriculum guide. It seems only to depict a generalized apathy toward the development and maintenance of relevant instructional materials for utilization in New Hampshire schools (Note: similar lack of knowledge, skills, and available materials were noted in both the art and science studies previously reported under Title III).

Professional Reading Personnel. Teacher-enrollees were asked if their schools had available the services of several categories of professional reading personnel. They were also questioned as to the number of students typically served by a remedial reading teacher in the average classroom.

Table XIII--Availability of Professional Reading Personnel in School System

Inquiry Statements and Personnel Categories	Response Modes	N	% Responding
(a) Does your school have the services of any of the following professional reading personnel:			
Remedial Reading Teacher	No Response	70	----
	Yes	362	66.9
	No	179	33.1
Reading Consultant	No Response	244	----
	Yes	118	32.2
	No	249	67.8
Reading Coordinator	No Response	251	----
	Yes	130	36.1
	No	230	63.9
Reading Supervisor	No Response	279	----
	Yes	77	23.2
	No	255	76.8
Other Specialists	No Response*	---	----
(b) If your school is served by a Remedial Reading Teacher, how many of your pupils does she work with (in average class)?	(# Responses	314	of 362)
	No Response	48	15.3
	Two or less	82	26.1
	3 - 5	132	42.0
	6 - 8	67	21.3
	9 - 11	11	3.5
	12 - 14	5	1.6
	15 or more	17	5.4

*Very few teachers indicated additional reading/language arts specialists other than those categorized above; one teacher-enrollee noted the availability of a specialist trained in the "motivation of slow learners" while others suggested roles most commonly associated with school guidance/counseling staff.

Data in Table XIII indicate that the Remedial Reading Teacher has become a visible role-function professional in New Hampshire schools. Fifty-nine per cent of the enrollee population noted the existence of a remedial reading teacher in their school (66.9% of those teachers directly responding to the item checked the availability of a remedial reading teacher). However, the role-function of the reading consultant, reading coordinator, and reading supervisor have not appeared in the mainstream of elementary school professional reading personnel. The supplementary item (b) revealed that the remedial reading teacher worked with an average of five ($\overline{X}=5.2$) pupils in the typieal classroom.

A series of items in the Teacher Inventory was designed to reveal (a) the environmental situation in which the classroom teacher made contact with professional reading specialists, and (b) the types of services provided the classroom teacher by each of four suggested categories of professional reading personnel.

> NOTE: as it appears that most New Hampshire schools employ only remedial reading teachers as their basic professional reading person, the environmental and service-function data presented below are in "count" form with no attempt made to perform further analyses of these data.

Data on the consulatative environment are presented in Table XIV. Supplementary information on services provided classroom teachers by professional reading personnel are summarized in Table XV (p.15).

Table XIV--Consultative Environment of Teacher-Specialist Interaction

	Inquiry Statement	RemdRdg Teacher	Reading Consult	Reading Coordnr	Reading Supervr
(a)	My classroom is visited on a regular basis by:	58	15	19	8
(b)	I am consulted on an individual basis outside the class by:	145	38	43	19
(c)	At my request, I am able to consult with:	247	91	84	43

Very few teacher-enrollees indicated need for additional services beyond those specified in Table XV. Of those who did request aid, most asked for further assistance from remedial reading teachers in helping the fast learner who is often hampered by the attention given the remedial student. This recommendation was especially noted by teachers at the kindergarten-grade two instructional level.

Table XV--Services Provided Classroom Teachers by Professional Reading Personnel*

	Description of Professional Service	RemdRdg Teacher	Reading Consult	Reading Coordnr	Reading Supervr
(1)	teaching reading in small group situations (less than 10 pupils)	195	3	4	6
(2)	teaching reading in large group situations (more than 10 pupils)	29	7	0	4
(3)	reading test interpretation for initial identification	136	14	20	11
(4)	reading test administration for initial identification	136	16	18	13
(5)	work on school reading schedule	81	16	13	16
(6)	referrals to other professional school personnel (e.g., nurse, etc.)	132	14	14	10
(7)	conferences with classroom teachers	164	29	5	10
(8)	conferences with parents	148	17	12	14
(9)	curriculum development	68	22	13	17
(10)	report of remedial students on separate report card system	53	3	2	1
(11)	report of remedial students on regular report card system	60	1	1	2
(12)	evaluating test results for remedial cases	152	23	20	17
(13)	follow-up research activities	49	17	5	10

*as experienced by teacher-enrollees

Finally, the teacher-enrollees were asked to respond to three inquiries relative to their perceived need for additional reading consultative personnel in their elementary schools. Response data to these items appear in Table XVI:

Table XVI--Teacher-Enrollee
Perceived Needs for Reading
Specialists Development

	Inquiry Statement	RemdRdg Teacher	Reading Consult	Reading Coordnr	Reading Supervr
(a)	Of the reading specialists not now serving your school, which type would you like to see made available to you?	57	71	37	22
(b)	Of the four types listed, which ONE would you most like to see made available?	116	29	13	7
(c)	What services would you most like to see him provide to you?	(Repeated Responses) * remedial help * individualized help for students * diagnostic testing services * consultation services * help for the advanced student (i.e., the "fast learner")			

As depicted in Table XIII one-third of the teacher-enrollees did not presently have available in their schools any type of professional reading personnel to assist them in their reading programs. The above data (Cf. Table XVI) indicate that over ninety per cent of these teachers would like to have made available at least one type of professional specialist in the reading/language arts area. The majority of the teachers in this group (64.8%) choose the remedial reading teacher as the specialist they'd most like to see made available to the classroom teacher. Finally, there were few responses to item (c), but the range of role-functions recorded indicate a perceived need for "total services" typically offered by the combination of four professional reading personnel labeled in this item series.

Reading/Language Arts Materials and Media. The workshop participants were asked to indicate the primary source reading texts used in their classrooms. Since many of the teachers were not specific and, furthermore, did not respond as might be expected to the phrase "Primary Source", the validity of response tabulation is in serious question. The copyright dates of the source texts reported by the teacher-enrollees doesn't, however, suggest some degree of concern for the somewhat "obsolete" texts currently being utilized in regional schools.

Table XVII--Primary Source Texts: by Types of Texts and Copyright Dates

Source Type	'49-'53		'54-'58		'59-'63		'64-'68	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(a) Basal Readers	9	1.7	34	6.5	149	28.6	328	63.1
(b) Skills Material	4	1.8	12	5.5	55	25.2	147	67.4
(c) Phonics Material	6	3.7	12	7.4	37	23.0	106	65.8
(d) Literature and Supplementary	4	3.5	9	8.0	45	39.8	55	48.7

Summary data on primary source material noted 757 basal readers were currently in use as primary material (33.7% of all material sources); skills materials numbered 568 (25.3); phonics material represented 447 entries (19.9); and literature and supplementary materials--such as Weekly Readers, S.R.A., etc.--numbered 473 (21.1). In all over 2200 cumulative text materials were reported by the teacher-enrollees (Note: some teachers utilized more than one source within a category thus confounding the validity of the "primary source" statement). In summary, only two-thirds of the source materials were post-1964 vintage; literature and supplementary sources were even more dated and often severly obsolete. An examination of source-type usage noted a relatively balanced choice of basal readers, skills material, phonics material, and literature.

An examination of available instructional media for use in the reading/language arts program revealed a gross lack of media materials in New Hampshire schools. Percentage data noted in Table XVIII are based on those teachers in the population who actually responded to the item and not on the total population of 611 enrollees.

The most commonly available and used category of instructional equipment included pictures and filmstrips. The more sophisticated equipment--accelerators, skimmer, pacer, controlled reader, and tachistoscope--were not available to over one-half of the teachers.

Table XVIII--Availability and Use of Instructional Media in Reading

Type of Equipment	Not Available	Available Used	Available Not Used	No Response
(a) accelerators	334 (85.4)	39 (10.0)	18 (4.6)	220
(b) controlled reader	265 (61.1)	123 (28.3)	46 (10.6)	177
(c) films	213 (49.0)	157 (36.1)	65 (14.9)	176
(d) filmstrips	101 (20.9)	268 (55.5)	114 (23.6)	128
(e) pacer	293 (79.2)	56 (15.1)	21 (5.7)	241
(f) pictures	129 (31.9)	245 (60.6)	30 (7.4)	207
(g) skimmer	302 (82.3)	35 (9.5)	30 (8.2)	244
(h) tachistoscope	240 (58.0)	102 (24.6)	72 (17.4)	197
(i) tapes	193 (43.0)	177 (39.4)	79 (17.6)	162

The relatively large number of responses to "filmstrips: available but not used" may be an indication of the ages of instructional equipment available in the schools. Finally, if it can be assumed that a "no response" record indicates that equipment was not indeed available, much of the equipment commonly associated with reading instruction is not available to most teachers in New Hampshire schools with the exception of pictures and filmstrips. The skimmer, for example, is apparently not available in 89.4% of the schools while instructional tapes are not present in over one-half of the elementary classrooms.

Phased Entry Programs Into the School Reading Program. In recent years the problem of individualizing human talent within the educational environment has become a national priority that has been identified, supported, and encouraged by such federal-state programs as Head Start, Titles I and III of ESEA, and similar efforts to reach pre-school children. In light of this concern the teacher-enrollees were asked to indicate the significance of various "entry programs" from which the children in their school are phased into the elementary level reading program. Results of this inquiry are depicted in Table XIX below.

Table XIX--Type of Entry
Program (pre-school/type)

Type of Pre-School Program*	N	% Total
Head Start O.E.O.	311	50.9
Nursery/Kindergarten	363	59.4
Transition and/or Articulation	15	2.4
Program from Home to School	135	22.1
Reading Readiness at Kindergarten	211	34.5
Grade 1 Entrance by Testing	149	24.4
Grade 1 Entrance by Chronol. Age	366	59.9
Other (e.g., reading laboratory)	15	2.4

*most children have had multiple experiences in a variety of entry programs

Of the types of pre-school experiences at entry, the most predominant program was "grade 1 entrance by chronological age" (38.5%) with "nursery/kindergarten" (28.0%); Head Start (3.6%), transition (1.1%), home-to-school (6.0), reading readiness at kindergarten (12.1%), grade 1 entrance by testing (9.6%), and other entry programs (1.1%) clearly indicate a lack of adequate objective assessment procedures prior to entry into the elementary reading program. Of some significance, however, is that Table XIX data reveal that over one-half of the teacher-enrollees noted at least one child in their classroom with prior experience in the federally-supported Head Start program.

Additional Characteristics of the Elementary Reading Instructional Program. The Title I participants were asked to respond to three separate inquiries relative to (a) the method(s) for grouping students for reading instruction, (b) basic approach(es) of the elementary instructional program, and (c) techniques of diagnosis currently practiced in their schools. Again, the data are unclear due to the predominance of multiple responses to the questionnaire items and care should be taken in the interpretation of these data.

Table XX--Methods of Grouping for Reading Instruction

Grouping Method	N	% Total
Chronological Age	106	13.3
Enrichment	96	12.1
Student Interests	79	10.0
Skill Needs Assessment	510	64.5

Table XXI--Basic Approach(es) of the Instructional Program

Basic Instructional Approach(es)	N	% Total
Basal	333	17.6
Basal and Phonetic Supplement	457	24.1
Individualized Reading	217	11.4
I.T.A.	5	0.3
Language Experience	210	11.1
Linguistics	80	4.2
Teacher-Made Materials	340	18.0
Words-In-Color	32	1.7
Intensive Phonics	217	11.5
Other (e.g., pictures, phonics key, etc.)	3	0.2

Table XXII--Techniques of Diagnosis

Diagnostic Technique	N	% Total
Informal Structured Diagnosis	162	10.1
Informal Reading Inventory	213	13.3
Standardized Tests	413	25.7
Teacher Observation	504	31.4
Teacher-Made-Tests	313	19.5

The data on methods of grouping appear to be rational with the exception of the category of chronological age (13.3%). It is assumed that such a criterion represents only a partial basis for student grouping for reading instruction, but there is no way of knowing how many teacher do indeed group solely on the basis of chronological age.

The wide variety of basic approaches utilized in the elementary reading instructional program can be seen from the data in Table XXI. Again, most teachers indicated their preference to employ multiple approaches to their programs. Of some interest, however, is the relatively large number of teachers who utilize teacher-made instructional materials. Just what proportion of these materials evolve from curriculum guides and other similar sources is unknown, but the earlier data on the availability of guides and source texts might suggest that many teachers construct their own instructional materials on an intuitive basis.

Slightly over one-quarter of the teacher-enrollees responded that they employed informal diagnosis as at least a partial criterion to individual diagnosis of reading difficulties (26.5%) while this technique represented only ten per cent of usage against the four additional techniques listed in the questionnaire. Again, teacher-made tests constituted a significant segment (19.5%) of enrollee response to the item.

Enrollee Rationale for Participating in Title I Course

Several common reasons for enrolling in a reading course were presented to the teachers for their assessment as to the significance of the stated reasons. The teachers responded on a four-point scale reflecting the level of importance to their decision. Finally, each teacher-enrollee was asked to indicate which of the stated reasons was most important in choosing to participate in the Title I course experience. These data are summarized in Tables XXIII-XXIV.

Perusal of these data clearly suggest three principal motivations for teacher enrollment in the course: (a) personal interest in reading and reading problems of students, (b) concern about their ability to teach reading, and (c) closeness to (availability of) the regional center in my area. Additional reasons of some lesser significance included needing the course for professional certification and the probable applicability of program credits toward a degree although both of these reasons were reported far less often than those noted above. In general teachers were seeking to develop their knowledge and skills in the area of reading and/or language arts with little concern expressed toward the applicability of program credits for formal graduate study. The presence of regional centers within close proximity to the teacher's home environment permitted access to the program; in all probability these teachers would have not pursued advanced study if the program had not been offered by the New Hampshire Network centers in the area.

Table XXIII--Reason for Enrolling in Title I Elementary Reading Workshop

Reason	No Response	Very Important	Of Some Importance	Of Little Importance	Not At All Important
closeness to the regional center in my area	32	294 (48.1)	223 (36.5)	38 (6.2)	24 (3.9)
personal interest in reading	25	518 (84.8)	62 (10.2)	5 (0.8)	1 (0.2)
school policy requirement	84	100 (16.4)	156 (25.5)	73 (12.0)	198 (32.4)
concern about my ability to teach reading	42	416 (68.1)	108 (17.7)	24 (3.9)	21 (3.4)
needed for professional certification	76	233 (38.1)	98 (16.0)	40 (6.5)	164 (26.8)
program and credits to be applied toward degree	148	68 (11.1)	35 (5.7)	31 (5.1)	329 (53.8)
reduced tuition	77	118 (19.3)	180 (29.5)	88 (14.4)	148 (24.2)
television lessons	81	70 (11.4)	189 (30.9)	98 (16.0)	173 (28.3)
knowledge of the regional instructor	109	40 (6.5)	93 (15.2)	58 (9.5)	311 (50.9)
other (general reasons)	---	8* ----	0 ----	2 ----	4 ----

*These eight teacher-enrollees also listed "other" as their single most important reason for enrolling in the course

Table XXIV--Single Most Important Reason for Enrolling in Course

	Actual Response	Rank	#Weighted Response	Rank
closeness to the regional center in my area	19 (3.1)	4	3.18	3
personal interest in reading	205 (33.6)	1.5	3.71	1
school policy requirement	11 (1.8)	5.5	1.98	6.5
concern about by ability to teach reading	214 (35.0)	1.5	3.37	2
needed for professional certification	80 (13.1)	3	2.41	4
program and credits to be applied toward degree	11 (1.8)	5.5	1.26	9
reduced tuition	8 (1.3)	7.5	2.19	5
television lessons	1 (0.2)	9.5	1.99	6.5
knowledge of the regional instructor	1 (0.2)	9.5	1.42	8
other	8 (1.3)	7.5	0.08	10

#Weighted response computation based on scale system where VI=4, OSI=3, OLI=2, NATI=1, and NR=0. Column indicates means.

Finally, several specific reasons for enrolling in the course were voiced by the teacher-enrollees. An examination of these stated motivations confirms the apparent need to offer the Title I course:

- looking for a new approach to reading instruction
- learning how to help the slow child
- as a refresher course (re-training)
- searching for new teaching aids
- how to teach the bilingual child
- understanding perceptual and auditory problems
- helping the disadvantaged child (socio-economically)

* enrichment for self and students
* learning about individualized reading programs
* search for more challenging reading materials
* learning diagnostic techniques
* structuring expansion of school reading program
* creating a meaningful library
* concern about dyslexia in children
* learning reinforcement skills
* learning how to work in self-contained classroom
* lack of experience in teaching of reading

- - - - - - - -

SECTION II

ASSESSMENT OF TARGETED PROCESS INFORMATION

Section II of this report focuses on the assessment of targeted process information including enrollee assessment of the fifteen-lesson instructional series, generally, and the associated television lessons, the study guide, the regional workshops, and the classroom followup activities.

The concern with evaluating each segment of the televised programs, their instructional manuals and follow-up activities led to the development of a standard Course Evaluation Survey for the fifteen content areas of the instructional sequence. The basic format of this evaluative document had been developed for the earlier Title III art and science courses as were the optical mark sense processing system and computer program and system speficications. Only minor modification in the narrative content of the Survey document itself was necessary prior to activation of the evaluative sequence.

Each lesson was evaluated by the teacher-enrollees one week following administrative and instructional presentation of materials associated with the lesson. Teacher responses to each inquiry statement were recorded on seperate optical mark sense documents to facilitate semi-automatic processing of response information. As in the earlier studies the Survey consisted of four distinct sections: The Television Lesson, The Study Guide, The Work Session, and The Classroom Follow-up. The context of each item segment was developed by a team of project participants representing the New Hampshire Network production staff and professional reading personnel assigned to the instructional staff of the project. Their joint recommendations for item content and format were then interfaced with the evaluative design and associated documents by the Bureau staff.

Participant opinions to the evaluative items were assessed on a four-point response scale parallel to the earlier studies.* The response-objective scale utilized in this evaluation is reproduced below:

Response Scale	Value	Objective Scale
Strongly Agree	4	Very Favorable
Agree	3	Favorable
Disagree	2	Unfavorable
Strongly Disagree	1	Very Unfavorable
(No Response)	(0)	(No Response)

---

*Although a comparative analysis of the instructional programs in art, science, and reading may not emerge, the evaluation team choose to equate evaluative design and document formats to permit such an analysis at some future date.

Results of the fifteen lesson evaluations are presented for each of the four segments of the instructional program noted above. No effort has been made to assess the statistical significance of these data since our primary target was to acquire descriptive indices of participants' perceptions of the program experience. Similarly, item analysis data, included in the Appendix section of this report, are not assessed as to the statistical relevancy of these data.

Some comparison is made between participant responses to and evaluation of the instructional segments. The principal comparative format is one of assessing the relative acceptability of the four program areas--the television lesson, the study guide, the work session, and the classroom follow-up. Again, these comparisons are non-statistical and aimed at providing global evaluative feedback to program administrative and instructional personnel.

The Television Lesson

The fifteen instructional programs produced and televised through the facilities of WENH-TV/New Hampshire Network, Durham, New Hampshire were assessed by nine items selected by the production and instructional personnel of the Title I project. On the basis of the "rating scale" format this section permitted a maximum score of thirty-six.

The data included in Table XXV note both the average rating for the series as well as the mean value of participant response to each televised program. The fifteen lessons are rank-ordered according to mean score value to facilitate examination of their perceived relative position of effect on teacher-enrollees.

> (Note: the analytical and data presentation procedures outlined above were replicated for each of the remaining three segments of the instructional program. Deviations from these procedures are noted in the text of the report.)

Finally, it should be noted that little effort was expended by the evaluation team to clean input documents prior to processing. It was assumed that the sample of processable documents utilized in the analyses would yield data representative of the total teacher-enrollee population. Thus, only valid and reliable (i.e., according to optical scan and computer processing requirements) evaluative input documents were employed for the analyses.

Examination of the data in Table XXV immediately reveals an unusual degree of consistency of favorable response to the television lessons. In both the Title III efforts in art and science many lessons were "isolated" from the total instructional package; that is, some lessons were perceived as extremely valuable where others were viewed as less than favorable. Only two reading lessons--

Table XXV--Rank-Order of Statistics on the Television Lesson

Lesson Week	Lesson Title	Rank	Average Score	Mean Value	N*
07	Individualized Reading	1.0	27.79	3.09	523
14	Children's Literature	2.0	27.70	3.08	520
06	Classroom Organization	3.0	27.22	3.02	545
05	Individual Diagnosis	4.0	27.17	3.02	519
01	Nature of Reading	5.0	27.07	3.01	526
10	Extending the Basal Reader	6.0	27.04	3.00	524
09	Directed Reading Lesson	7.0	26.84	2.98	538
02	Factors That Affect Reading	8.0	26.79	2.98	410
04	Classroom Diagnosis	9.0	26.71	2.97	596
15	Review and Summary	10.0	26.69	2.97	420
13	Study Skills	11.0	26.62	2.96	516
08	Reading Readiness	12.0	26.61	2.96	525
03	Problems That Inhibit Reading	13.0	26.40	2.93	417
12	Programmed Material	14.0	25.41	2.82	524
11	Linguistics & Intensive Readg.	15.0	24.33	2.70	526

*N varies according to enrollee participation in evaluation and cleanliness of document input; Ns are idenical for all tables in this Section.

Programmed Material and Linguistic & Intensive Reading--appear to have been isolated from the reading program's receptivity by the teacher-enrollees. Even these lessons were rated slightly unfavorable by the viewers.

In general, the fifteen television lessons were rated "favorable" by the teacher-enrollees, and average score and rating indices appear to indicate the need for only minor revisions aimed at improving the instructional format. Finally, the weekly distribution of lessons on a rank-order basis suggest that few "dead spots" developed during the fifteen-week course the only apparent exception being the noted Programmed Material and Linguistic lessons which were presented in weeks twelve and eleven, respectibly.

The Study Guide

Seven evaluative items were developed by the project team to assess the applicability of the extensive curriculum guide for the course. A maximum score of twenty-eight was possible in response to this segment of the Evaluation Survey. Results of teacher-enrollee evaluation of the Study Guide are tabulated in Table XXVI. As previously noted the number of cases reporting for each weekly evaluation are identical to those data on the Television Lesson.

Table XXVI--Rank-Order of Statistics on the Study Guide

Lesson Week	Lesson Title	Rank	Average Score	Mean Value
14	Children's Literature	1.0	20.98	3.00
09	Directed Reading Lesson	2.0	20.78	2.97
07	Individualized Reading	3.0	20.70	2.96
04	Classroom Diagnosis	4.0	20.56	2.94
10	Extending the Basal Reader	5.0	20.64	2.95
08	Reading Readiness	6.5	20.62	2.95
13	Study Skills	6.5	20.62	2.95
05	Individual Diagnosis	8.0	20.56	2.94
02	Factors That Affect Reading	9.0	20.47	2.92
15	Review and Summary	10.0	20.35	2.91
03	Problems That Inhibit Reading	11.5	20.31	2.90
06	Classroom Organization	11.5	20.31	2.90
01	Nature of Reading	13.0	20.23	2.89
12	Programmed Material	14.0	20.06	2.87
11	Linguistics & Intensive Readg	15.0	18.75	2.68

The value of interfacing a variety of techniques in the instructional program (e.g., television lesson and study guide, for an example) appear in the instructional target of Classroom Organization, specifically. While this lesson was rated third on the value of the television medium it ranked a low 11.5 on the study guide. Similarly, study skills was rated eleventh on television but received a 6.5 value rating on the study guide. A final example--reading readiness--was rated twelvth when communicated by television and placed in 6.5 position out of fifteen when its instructional context and input was communicated via the guide.

Thus it appears that the teacher-enrollees were somewhat discriminating in their assessments of the lessons and seemed to focus on that instructional tool that most suited their perceived needs. As was found to be true with teacher assessment of the television lessons the various lessons included in the study guide were judged to be of essentially equal value to the participants. The only exception was the lesson on linguistics and intensive reading which was rated appreciably lower than the other fourteen instructional segments.

It might be advisable to carefully examine the item analysis output on the study guide to determine the need for specific lesson revisions of the instructional material. No effort was made to include such an assessment of the study guide content and relevancy as perceived by the workshop participants.

The Work Session

The work session was designed to provide each course participant with an opportunity to experience implementation of the concepts, procedures, and materials associated with the instructional program. Appropriate experienced instructional personnel were assigned to the twenty-one regional centers to coordinate work session activities and to serve as instructional consultants to the teacher-enrollees.

This segment of the instructional program was evaluated by nine selected items presented in the Course Evaluation Survey and allowed for a maximum score of thirty-six. Results of this sequential evaluation over the fifteen-week course are documented in Table XXVII.

Table XXVII--Rank-Order of Statistics on the Work Session

Lesson Week	Lesson Title	Rank	Average Score	Mean Value
14	Children's Literature	1.0	26.51	2.95
13	Study Skills	2.0	25.99	2.89
09	Directed Reading Lesson	3.0	25.95	2.88
07	Individualized Reading	4.0	25.66	2.85
05	Individual Diagnosis	5.0	25.54	2.84
12	Programmed Material	6.0	25.51	2.83
10	Extending the Basal Reader	7.0	25.45	2.83
15	Review and Summary	8.0	25.43	2.83
06	Classroom Organization	9.0	25.23	2.80
02	Factors That Affect Reading	10.0	25.21	2.80
04	Classroom Diagnosis	11.0	25.10	2.79
08	Reading Readiness	12.0	25.07	2.79
01	Nature of Reading	13.0	23.63	2.63
03	Problems That Inhibit Reading	14.0	23.62	2.62
11	Linguistics & Intensive Readg	15.0	23.61	2.62

Examination of the tabulated data above clearly indicate the type of instructional lessons best suited for "hands-on" work session activities under the direction of staff consultants. Such areas as study skills, individual diagnosis and especially programmed material and their associated documentation and instrumentation are efficiently and pragmatically tied into the total instructional course. Again, the effects of the multiple instructional format of the Title I program are clearly visible when an intuitive comparative assessment is made of data on the television lesson, the study guide, and the work session data presented above. Finally, that the work session did not concentrate on Lessons 1, 3, and 11 indicate the principal focus of the work session activity and intent.

The Classroom Follow-Up

The classroom follow-up was designed to permit the participants to evaluate the effectiveness of accrued program knowledge and skills when such knowledge was transferred to their individual elementary school environment. Enrollee responses to this four-item series are tabulated below and yield a maximum score of sixteen.

Table XXVIII--Rank-Order of Statistics on the Classroom Follow-Up

Lesson Week	Lesson Title	Rank	Average Score	Mean Value
02	Factors That Affect Reading	1.0	11.84	2.96
05	Individual Diagnosis	2.0	11.82	2.96
04	Classroom Diagnosis	3.0	11.79	2.95
13	Study Skills	4.0	11.69	2.92
14	Children's Literature	5.0	11.65	2.91
09	Directed Reading Lesson	6.0	11.62	2.90
06	Classroom Organization	7.0	11.58	2.90
12	Programmed Material	8.0	11.53	2.88
07	Individualized Reading	9.0	11.50	2.88
01	Nature of Reading	10.0	11.36	2.84
08	Reading Readiness	11.0	11.35	2.84
10	Extending the Basal Reader	12.0	11.06	2.77
03	Problems That Inhibit Reading	13.0	10.98	2.75
15	Review and Summary	14.0	8.60	2.15
11	Linguistics & Intensive Readg	15.0	7.72	1.93

Differences in the rank-order of the instructional lessons when reported for the classroom follow-up in comparison with the earlier tabular data tend to illustrate which lessons had practical and immediate impact on the teacher-enrollees' classrooms. Perusal of the lessons listed above seem to indicate that the participants (a) become more sensitive to factors that affect reading, (b) the applicability of individual diagnosis techniques to the elementary student became a significant factor in examining the elementary reading program at the classroom level on an individual and total classroom basis, (c) specific instructibnal skills and materials were administered in the enrollees' classrooms, and (d) many of the "standard" theoretical and applied segments of the school reading program (e.g. individualized reading and the basal reader) were of secondary interest to the teachers in the applied environment of the classroom.

Over-all Lesson Evaluation

The four preceding subsections presented the results of participant perceptions of each segment of the instructional program. A more comprehensive view of the over-all reading program as assessed by the Course Evaluation Survey was accomplished by cumulating the response scores over the four instructional segments. The results of this documentation are presented in Table XXIX. It should be noted that no attempt was made to differentially weigh the instructional segments. The maximum score was 116 for the total of twenty-nine items included in the Survey.

Table XXIX--Rank-Order of Statistics on the Total Course Evaluation

Lesson Week	Lesson Title	Rank	Average Score	Mean Value
14	Children's Literature	1.0	86.86	2.99
07	Individualized Reading	2.0	85.66	2.95
09	Directed Reading Lesson	3.0	85.19	2.94
05	Individual Diagnosis	4.0	85.10	2.93
13	Study Skills	5.0	84.92	2.93
06	Classroom Organization	6.0	84.35	2.91
02	Factors That Affect Reading	7.0	84.31	2.91
04	Classroom Diagnosis	8.0	84.28	2.91
10	Extending the Basal Reader	9.0	84.19	2.90
08	Reading Readiness	10.0	83.65	2.88
12	Programmed Materials	11.0	82.52	2.85
#03	Problems That Inhibit Reading	12.0	81.31	2.80
#01	Nature of Reading	13.0	82.29	2.84
15	Review and Summary	14.0	81.06	2.80
11	Linguistics & Intensive Readg	15.0	74.40	2.57

#Rank-order of lessons 01 and 03 inadvertently reversed during typesetting for this report; scale values and data attributed to each lesson are accurate as reported above.

As noted in an earlier subsection (Cf. The Television Lesson) all but one instructional program seemed to be well-received by the participants. The variance of perceived instructional value common to the art and science courses did not appear in the Title I reading course. Of particular interest is that instructional segments which might be classified as materials-oriented, diagnostic-oriented, and technique-oriented were viewed as being of equal value to the participants. Only one lesson--Linguistics and Intensive Reading--was critically perceived on a consistent basis (i.e., across all instructional segments) by the teacher-enrollees. This lesson should be carefully examined and a decision be reached relative to its revision and/or termination from the total instructional package of the reading course.

Comparative Data on Instructional Segments

The data in Table XXX below are included to provide an opportunity for comparative assessment of the four instructional segments of the Title I course in reading. Basic measures of central tendencies (i.e. mean data) are presented for each of the four segments--the television lesson, the study guide, the work session, and the classroom follow-up activity--based on (a) average score data and (b) mean value data. It should be noted that average score data are misleading since the maximum score of each segment varies according to the number of items included in the Survey; mean value data are comparative as each segment mean is based on a standard response-objective scale.

Table XXX--Comparative Mean Data:
Average Score and Mean Value
for Four Instructional Segments
and Over-all Lesson Evaluation

Instructional Segment	Maximum Score	Mean Average Score	Mean Value
The Television Lesson	36.00	26.69	2.97
The Study Guide	28.00	20.40	2.92
The Work Session	36.00	25.17	2.80
The Classroom Follow-Up	16.00	11.07	2.77
Overall Evaluation	116.00	83.33	2.87

Examination of the comparative mean value data appears to indicate a well-balanced presentation of the four segment instructional program. The over-all mean rating was most favorable and the data reflected a small variance between the segments (s=.095).

A somewhat different assessment of the total reading course was accomplished by computing the average ranking of the fifteen lessons over the four instructional segments. The resulting average ranking data are presented in Table XXXI and might be compared with the rank structure on the total course evaluation noted in Table XXIX.

Table XXXI--Average Rank of Lessons
Over Four Program Segment Rankings

Lesson Week	Lesson Title	Average Ranking
14	Children's Literature	2.25
07	Individualized Reading	4.25
09	Directed Reading Lesson	4.50
05	Individual Diagnosis	4.75
13	Study Skills	5.88
04	Classroom Diagnosis	6.75
02	Factors That Affect Reading	7.00
10	Extending the Basal Reader	7.50
06	Classroom Organization	7.62
01	Nature of Reading	10.25
08	Reading Readiness	10.38
12	Programmed Materials	10.50
15	Review and Summary	10.50
03	Problems That Inhibit Reading	12.88
11	Linguistics and Intensive Reading	15.00

Whereas Table XXIX data suggest that with one exception the fifteen instructional lessons were viewed "equally valuable" when judged on the basis of average acore and/or mean value, the assessment of the total reading course based on the average ranking over four program segments yields an apparent hierarchy of value assigned to the individual lessons.

Children's Literature--ranked high over all program segments--emerges as the major lesson of the instructional sequence. In fact, the distinction between this lesson and the remaing fourteen lessons might suggest the need to develop and instructional program focusing directly (perhaps exclusively) on children's literature rather than as a segment of a reading program for elementary teachers.

At the other response-pole, the poor receptivity of program participants to Lesson 11--Linguistics and Intensive Reading--suggests that this area might be dropped from subsequent programs . Lesson 03, however, should be strengthened to elicit a more favorable response from program participants (note: this lesson did receive favorable response in terms of specified instructional segments but not on an over-all rating basis).

Finally, it is recommended that program administrators consider the feasibility of presenting subsequent instructional courses in elementary reading in two distinct sections. First, the overall instructional program might focus on Lessons 14 through 06 (as presented in Table XXXI hierarchy) since these lessons appear to most adequately and effectively respond to the needs of elementary teachers. A second program section could target Lessons 01 through 03 (again, as presented in Table XXXI) while eliminating Linguistics and Intensive Reading and an instructional lesson. In short, the participant response seems to suggest the need for differential attention upon clusters of lessons rather than continuing an equal presentation (in time) of the fifteen instructional lessons. The highest-ranked lessons (nine) might receive primary emphasis while the remaining five lessons be treated as "supplementary" foci of the instructional program. It should be noted, however, that a carefully designed content analysis of the instructional program might negate the above recommendation which is, in fact, based solely on an examination of average rankings of participant evaluations of each lesson.

SECTION III

ASSESSMENT OF PRE-POST TEST DATA AND SUBJECTIVE STAFF EVALUATIONS

Section III of this report focuses on the assessment of pre-post changes in the cognitive skills level of workshop participants. Also included in this Section is an abstract of an evaluation report prepared by the instructional staff of the Title I project that presented on-going program data gathered from both the enrolled teachers and the regional center instructors.

Pre-Course Differential Skills

It was assumed by project administrators that regional differences might exist relative to the level of pre-course knowledge and skills in elementary reading instruction. Much of this assumption was based on cultural-ethnic differences and demographic characteristics of the state of New Hampshire. The "North Country" region--represented by, for example, the Berlin regional center--is basically a bi-lingual (i.e., Frech-English) population with many schools enrolling mono-lingual French-Canadian students. The urban areas--Manchester, Nashua, Dover, etc.--are heavily bi-lingual and represent a wide range of socio-economic and cultural groups. The major concern of program administrators was that differential levels of instructional skills, if any, should be identified early in the project since the primary orientation of the program focused heavily on the presentation of theoretical constructs underlying reading instruction with only secondary attention placed upon the practical or applied impact of the instructional program. It was anticipated that two "tracks" of instruction might be appropriate should major differences exist either within or between regional centers. The primary track would continue to center on the theoretical aspects of the instructional program design while a secondary track would attempt to more consciously relate theory to practice for those enrollees who would most benefit from this mode of instruction.

A review test designed by the project instructional team was administered to all program participants at the first meeting of the regional workshop sessions. The instrument focused heavily on such areas as awareness of professional literature, instructional techniques for reading instruction, and the like. Results of the pre-course test administration are summarized in Table XXXII by regional center and for the total teacher-enrollee population. Statistical tests of center versus total group differences were performed and are reported in the Table.

Table XXXII--Differential Levels of Pre-Course Preparation: Data by Regional Center and Total

Center Code	Regional Center	N	$\bar{X}$	s	t	Signif. of p
707	Ashland	31	23.42	5.28	-0.176	n.s.
709	Berlin	27	21.74	3.49	-2.650	>.01
712	Claremont	25	24.28	5.04	+0.626	n.s.
718	Farmington	27	21.59	5.51	-1.906	>.05
719	Franklin	31	24.10	5.50	+0.507	n.s.
721	Hopkinton	29	24.03	4.72	+0.491	n.s.
723	Kittery	28	24.21	4.86	+0.661	n.s.
724	Hanover	30	23.80	5.33	+0.212	n.s.
726	Littleton	29	23.17	4.12	-0.533	n.s.
727	Manchester #1	31	21.90	4.71	-1.949	n.s.
767	Manchester #2	28	22.18	3.99	-1.818	n.s.
729	Nashua	34	23.21	4.44	-0.484	n.s.
733	Peterborough	30	22.83	4.23	-0.956	n.s.
734	Portsmouth	29	23.34	3.45	-0.374	n.s.
738	Wolfeboro	27	25.78	5.11	+2.190	>.05
740	Salem #1	32	23.87	5.04	+0.307	n.s.
741	Salem #2	30	24.80	3.85	+1.662	n.s.
744	Hampton	28	23.43	3.80	-0.215	n.s.
756	Dover #1	16	22.87	3.81	-0.741	n.s.
757	Dover #2	30	25.40	3.68	+2.593	>.01
759	Keene	33	24.97	4.68	+1.649	n.s.
	TOTAL ALL CENTERS	605	23.59	4.64	------	----

Examination of pre-course data by regional center indicated a distinct presence of regional center differences coupled with individual enrollee differences within centers resulting in the development of the two-track instructional system to be implimented at the discretion of each regional instructor. The ultimate track system employed by the instructors is indicated below:

Regional Center	1'	2'	Regional Center	1'	2'
Ashland	A	---	Nashua	A	B
Berlin	B	---	Peterborough	A	B
Claremont	B	---	Portsmouth	B	---
Farmington	B	A	Wolfeboro	A	B
Franklin	B	---	Salem #1	A	B
Hopkinton	B	A	Salem #2	B	A
Kittery	A	B	Hampton	A	B
Hanover	A	B	Dover #1	A	---
Littleton	B	---	Dover #2	A	B
Manchester #1	A	---	Keene	B	---
Manchester #2	A	B			

The Berlin regional center, for example, exclusively adopted the "B" or combination theoretical-applied instructional track in response to participant needs; Wolfeboro, on the other hand, utilized both the primarily theoretical and combination tracks in response to the variability of participant backgrounds in reading instruction but focused on the "A" track as the primary instructional technique. The Dover #1 center employed the "A" track since the limited enrollment (N=16) permitted individualized attention for those participants who might need supplementary assistance in understanding and utilizing concepts and materials emitting from the instructional program. In short, the choice of track(s) was left to the discretion of individual regional instructors and their assessments of group needs, but the option of differential program tracks allowed for a more individualized response to participant needs.

Pre-Post Review Test Administration

In order to assess pre-to-post course changes in acquired knowledge and skills of each participant the review test was administered at the conclusion of the fifteen-week instructional program. Although only 387 "clean" participant response sheets were matched for the pre and post test administration this sample (64% of total group) was assumed to provide an adequate basis for the statistical test for individual growth.

The course population mean for the pre-test was 23.74 with a standard deviation of 4.78; post-test mean was computed at 28.95 with its mean at 4.03 for the 387 matched cases. Computation of a change score on an individual basis yielded a mean difference of 5.22 with s=3.14. The statistical test for significance resulted in a t=+16.38 significant beyond .01. These data clearly indicate a significant individual participant growth in knowledge and skills relative to elementary reading instruction as a result of the Title I program's impact.

Evaluation of Participant and Regional Instructor

An interim evaluation report system was developed by the Title I project team to provide on-going assessment of teacher-participant and regional instructional staff response to the program effort. A summary report, prepared by Mary Pine of the project staff, served as the input source for the documentation of participant and instructor responses (Cf. Appendix E).

Two distinct methods of data collection were employed by the project team: (a) on-site visitations at thirteen of the twenty-one regional centers to discuss with course participants their assessments of the Title I project; and, (b) conferences with regional instructors to discuss program segments and lessons as well as their reactions to operational phases of the instructional effort.

Response of Teacher-Participants. The objective of the visitation program was to provide an opportunity for enrollees to discuss the impact of the instructional program on their individual classroom reading program and, hopefully, to provide on-site (i.e. classroom) observational-consultative services to program participants. At each of the thirteen selected centers the evaluation team requested a voluntary invitation from enrollees to come into their classrooms. Although over 350 participants were approached in this manner, only one teacher granted this permission for on-site observation. The project team assumed that this reaction occurred due to one or more of the following reasons: (a) many teachers felt insecure about their ability and classroom performance in reading instruction, especially during the early weeks of the instructional program; (b) teachers were unaccustomed to having visitors in their classrooms; (c) teacher-participants were laboring under the misconception that project supervisors had requested on-site visitations in order to evaluate and/or criticize their classroom performance rather than to serve as consultants to the participants. In short, the effort to provide consultative services was not feasible because of the reluctance of the participating teachers to cooperate in this part of the program, but did point clearly to the need to more adequately develop on-going consultative linkages between the formal instructional program and the everyday classroom program.

Response of Regional Instructors. Analysis of regional instructor comments presented in both center reports and in discussion groups suggested that opinions focused upon six major areas:

1. It was most apparent that the regional instructors considered the course of decided value for teacher-participants.

2. An observable growth was noted in the regional instructors themselves and in their attitudes toward and appreciation of the classroom teachers. Consultants became more aware of the inadequate background of teachers in reading instruction and suggested the need for program adjustments to more adequately serve the needs of participants (e.g., the design and development of instructional "tracks" noted previously).

3. General reactions to the telecasts were excellent. Both the participants and regional consultant-instructors enjoyed the television teacher's style of presentation and felt that, in the vast majority of cases, the filmed classroom demonstrations were very useful. Regional instructors felt free to constructively critique the instructional program and detailed their recommendations for changes in the instructional program.

4. In general the consultants' reactions to the instructional lesson sequence were logical and appropriate although their were occasional suggestions for change in lesson sequence.

5. The regional instructors were strongly supportive of the study guide which accompanied the course format. They felt the guide was precise, well organized, and contained an abundance of specific suggestions for implementing the instructional segments of the course. Consultants identified perceived weaknesses in specific sections of the study guide and suggested alternative methods of relieving these problems.

6. The area of assignments was heavily criticized in terms of the time required to adequately complete course-related assignments applicable to both the work session and the classroom follow-up activities, the quantity of work required of participants including a perceived over-abundance of extracurricular reading and follow-up activities, and the over-expectations of project staff with regard to the more theoretical and philosophical orientation of the instructional program

Finally, the interim evaluation report noted a high degree of correlation between the comments of the regional instructors and those of the teacher-participants regarding their perceptions of the course. Many of the responses of the teachers were highly personalized and appeared to focus on minute detail. Student statements dealing with picayune detail were strongest and more predominant in the beginning stages of the course. Data collected at the mid-point and final stages, however, were more general and objective in nature. The evaluation team judged that this transformation seemed to reflect professional growth and development of a greater sensitivity to and understanding of the reading process. It was also hypothecized that such changes in response to the course might suggest an increased degree of participant adjustment to the rather unusual instructional approach to the course itself.

SECTION IV

ASSESSMENT OF FINAL COURSE EVALUATION DATA

Section IV summarizes the results of a final course evaluation conducted by the New Hampshire Network project staff relative to participants' retrospective assessments of their over-all course experiences.

The questionnaire consisted of sixteen check-list items and five open-ended items. The former type focused on assessment of the over-all program effort as well as soliciting recommendations for changes in the instructional program segments. The remaining five items were more general in nature but attempted to solicit narrative responses to the program including the detailed specification of suggested changes in the program.

As it appeared from a perusal of these data that the interim evaluation system data (Cf. Section III) closely paralleled participant responses to the narrative response items of the questionnaire, only the sixteen-item check-list segment of the final evaluation survey is reported and discussed in this section.

Data from the final course evaluation are summarized in two sections. First, Table XXXIII includes data on items related to the assessment of individual televised lessons and associated activities--e.g. "Which television lesson seems to be most in need of revision?" Per cent response data are reported only for those lessons in which 10% or more of the participants responded to that item-lesson inquiry. The second section summarizes participant responses to a series of items not in themselves specific to any one instructional lesson--e.g. "In general, the pace of the TV presentations was ...." Again, these data are summarized in terms of per cent of participants responding to item alternatives.

Assessment of Individual Televised Lessons

A comparison of Table XXXIII data with the summary data on weekly lesson evaluations (Cf. Table XXIX, p. 31) reveals some interesting "discrepancies" in reported assessment of individual lessons. It should be noted, however, that the Course Evaluation Survey data were collected on a on-going basis; that is, participants were asked to evaluate each lesson upon completion of that lesson. The final course evaluation, on the other hand, was retrospective in that enrollees were asked to assess each lesson in comparison with all other lessons and the over-all impact of the instructional program.

Table XXXIII--Summary of Final Course Evaluation Data Related to Assessment of Individual Lessons

(Percentage Response Data to Each Item)

Week of Lesson Presentation and Title of Lesson:	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15
Inquiry Statements-- Per Cent Data for Primary Responses by Lesson	Nature of Reading	Factors That Affect Reading	Problems That Inhibit Reading	Classroom Diagnosis	Individual Diagnosis	Classroom Organization	Individualized Reading	Reading Readiness	Directed Reading Lesson	Extending the Basal Reader	Linguistics and Intensive Readg	Programmed Materials	Study Skills	Children's Literature	Review and Summary
1. Which television lesson seems to be in most need of revision?				11	11						30	22			
4. Check program(s) on which the pace was definitely too fast.				12	15						22	14			
5. The single TV lesson of the most practical value to me was ...					12		30	10							
6. The single TV lesson of the least practical value to me was ...								10			28	27			
14. The single classroom activity, conducted as a result of this course, that I rate as most successful was related to lesson ...					24		19			10			10	12	
15. The single classroom activity assignment that I found least practical or successful was related to lesson ...					16						20	26			

When asked on the final course evaluation to identify which television lesson seemed to be in most need of revision the participants specified four lessons--Linguistics and Intensive Reading, Programmed Materials, Classroom Diagnosis, and Individual Diagnosis. An examination of the weekly lesson assessments, however, suggested that both the Individual Diagnosis and Classroom Diagnosis lessons were perceived very favorably by the enrollees (Linguistics and Programmed Materials were rated low on both the weekly and final course evaluations). Some understanding of these apparently conflicting assessments might be gained by noting that participants and regional instructors were somewhat critical of the time allotments and assignment loads for both diagnostic-oriented lessons.

Two additional "conflicts" or plausible problem areas are noted from data in Table XXXIII. First, although the lesson on Reading Readiness was rated as a "most practical" instructional program by ten per cent of the enrollees a like number of participants also rated this lesson as having the least practical value. A similar response was elicited for the item relative to most successful and least successful classroom activity where 24% of the enrollees felt that the lesson on Individual Diagnosis was most applicable and 16% suggested that it was the least applicable or successful classroom activity. In both of these instances it seems that the variability in the background of participants might account for the conflicting evaluative data. A different explanation might be that for some participants Individual Diagnosis was functionally relevant to their classroom environment while for others the concept and applicability of individual diagnosis techniques was not realistic in their school environment.

In general the data emerging from the final course evaluation appear to support the findings of the weekly course evaluation survey with minor deviations in rated value to the participants.

Assessment of General Response to Program

A series of items were included in the final course evaluation to solicit enrollee response to several items of concern to the project administration and staff including evaluation of filmed segments, workshop activities, and the study guide for the instructional program.

Again, it appears from the data that the pre-course variability in background contributed to the assessment of the Title I project. Item 2, for example, suggests that some participants either were in need of or would have preferred that the TV lessons had been presented in greater detail. The development and implimentation of the "track system" was undoubtably helpful in overcoming the problem of variable needs of workshop participants. Similarly, the differential response ratings of the instructional lesson

Table XXXIV--Summary of Final Course Evaluation Data on the General Inquiry Items

Inquiry Statements and Response Alternatives	% Response
2. In general, the TV lessons	
a. should have been presented in greater detail	30.0
b. had the right amount of detailed information	63.6
c. should have been presented in less detail	6.4
3. In general, the pace of the TV presentations was	
a. too slow	4.0
b. about right	51.5
c. too fast	15.8
d. varied	28.7
8. Filmed segments in the TV lessons were	
a. too long	4.8
b. about right	78.6
c. too short	16.6
d. very relevant to the topic	54.2
e. moderately relavant to the topic	45.4
f. not relevant to the topic	0.4
g. gave me practical ideas for classroom use	85.7
h. were not practical for my classroom	14.3
i. not believable (I did not find them ...)	12.0
j. believable (I found them believable)	88.0
9. In general, I ( ) the filmed segments.	
a. did like	80.7
b. did not like	19.3
10. In general, I found the ideas presented in the TV lessons and the activities in the regional center	
a. closely related	60.0
b. moderately related	35.1
c. slightly related	4.8
d. not at all related	2.1
11. In general, I found the activities at the regional center	
a. very useful	57.2
b. moderately useful	36.7
c. not at all useful	6.1

Table XXXIV--Summary of Final Course Evaluation Data on the General Inquiry Items (Cont.)

Inquiry Statements and Response Alternatives	% Response			
16. In general, I found the study guide				
a. very helpful	47.6			
b. moderately helpful	43.2			
c. of very little or no help	9.2			
	% Response Rating			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
13. Ratings of individual parts of instructional lesson (over all lessons):				
a. Pre-TV discussion	10.2	46.1	19.1	24.6
b. View TV	17.4	22.4	41.0	19.2
c. Post-TV discussion	22.6	23.7	26.2	27.5
d. Work-study sessions	52.8	9.2	11.2	26.8

segments (Cf. Item 13) would suggest that enrollees focused on the modes of presentation according to their unique needs and preferences.

The final course evaluation appears to confirm the general findings of the on-going weekly course evaluation effort. The two evaluative systems coupled with the staff training session evaluations seemed to permit a very adequate and meaningful gathering of information on the total program that could be used in the decision-making processes of the Title I project. The weekly evaluations yielded data on an on-going basis which permitted the development and implementation of program modifications on an on-going basis; the final course evaluation provided "overview" data for use by program administrators in reaching decisions relative to the structure and operational components of the project; and the interview data provided program staff and teacher participants with opportunities to inject their perceptions of and suggestions for improving the program with those narrative inputs being detailed and in-depth feedback to all personnel associated with the Title I project.

SECTION V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The television course--TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING--represented the third in a series of innovative instructional programs developed and produced by the New Hampshire Network for dissemination to elementary teachers in northern New England. Again, as was found true in the earlier elementary art and elementary science workshops, the instructional program bridged the gap created by geographical isolation from institutions of higher education and provided an opportunity for over six-hundred teacher-enrollees to improve their skills by participating in the activities at twenty-one regional centers throughout New Hampshire.

Examinations of teacher-enrollee characteristics data revealed a near carbon-copy of the art and science teacher in New Hampshire. Enrollee age, employment, preparation, and motivations for participating in the Title I reading program paralleled the earlier findings of the art and science programs. Several summary observations should be of particular interest to the State Department of Education, institutions of teacher preparation, and local educational agencies:

- New Hampshire elementary teachers view teaching as a contingent rather than career occupation; attrition rates, therefore, will continue at a relatively high level, and teachers will continue to view degrees and certification standards (especially graduate study) as being relatively unnecessary and impractical. Thus, the concept of in-service programs must be seriously examined by educational decision-makers if the State hopes to maintain some degree of quality instruction in the elementary school.

- Program data clearly suggest that the average number of students in the elementary classroom is rapidly increasing and presents some real concern for teachers and administrators relative to the development and maintainance of effective instructional programs in reading. This problem area receives some additional negative support when one considers the professional preparation characteristics of the typical New Hampshire elementary teacher in the area of reading instruction, generally, and the diagnosis and treatment of reading difficulties, specifically. Further concern is suggested when one examines the general lack of instructional media and materials available to the elementary teacher in New Hampshire.

- * Less than one-half of the schools in New Hampshire (49.5%) do not have a curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts for the elementary grades; of those schools that do have a curriculum guide, less than one-fifth of the teacher-enrollees had participated in the development of the guide applicable to their grade level.

- * Slightly over one-half of the enrollees reported the existence of an elementary-level remedial reading teacher in their school system. However, the role-function of the professional reading consultant, reading coordinator, and reading supervisor have not yet appeared in the mainstream of elementary school professional reading personnel in New Hampshire schools. The development of higher-level professional personnel would require advanced study (enrollees are not interested), more adequate financial support of instructional programs (most systems and the state at large generally refuse to adequately support the educational budgets), etc.

- * Only two-thirds of the primary source materials for elementary reading instruction in New Hampshire schools are post-1964 vintage; relevant literature and supplementary sources were even more dated and often severly obsolete.

- * Slightly over one-quarter of the teacher enrollees employ informal diagnosis as at least a partial criterion to individual diagnosis of reading difficulties. Only 26.5% of the teachers utilized diagnostic techniques as an integral segment of their reading program. Given the earlier concern for the status of professional preparation and fiscal support of reading programs, one real concern is the quality, validity and reliability of teacher-made tests employed by nearly twenty per cent of the teachers.

Assessments of target process information, including enrollee assessment of the fifteen-lesson instructional series, revealed a very favorable response to the Title I program effort. Only one lesson--Linguistics and Intensive Reading--was severly criticized by both the participants and the regional instructors.

As a specific recommendation it is suggested that program administrators consider the feasibility of presenting subsequent instructional courses in elementary reading in two distinct sections. First, the overall instructional program might focus on Lessons 14 through 06 (as presented in Table XXXI hierarchy, p. 33) since these lessons appeared to most adequately and effectively respond to the needs of the elementary teachers. A second program section could target Lessons 01 - 03 (Cf. Table XXXI, p. 33) while either critically modifying or eliminating Linguistics and Intensive

Reading as an instructional lesson. In short, the response of program participants suggests the need for differential attention upon clusters of lessons rather than continuing an equal presentation (in time) of the fifteen instructional lessons.

Although a significant difference was computed for the pre-post course growth of participants in elementary reading concepts and techniques, perhaps the major finding of on-going assessment was the need to establish "instructional tracks" to more adequately meet the needs of program participants. It is recommended that the two-track (or more, if necessary) system be further refined and implemented for subsequent instructional courses in reading. (It is hypothesized that multiple-track systems would also be applicable in elementary art and reading instruction courses since the characteristics of the course populations are essentially identical.)

The program effort to provide consultative services to teacher-enrollees on an on-site (i.e., the teacher's classroom) basis was thwarted due to the reluctance on the part of the participating teachers to cooperate in this part of the program. This program finding pointed clearly to the need to more adequately develop on-going consultative linkages between formal instructional programs--of the State Department of Education, institutions of higher education, and local educational agencies--and the instructional programs as implimented in the elementary classroom by the teacher. Thus, program evaluators found reluctance toward receiving consultative services from professional reading personnel but also identified a critical need to provide consultative services and personnel to enhance the development of quality elementary reading programs.

The Interim Evaluation Report noted a high degree of correlation between the comments of the regional instructors and those of the teacher-participants regarding their perceptions of the Title I course. It appears that pre-course variability in professional background, training, and the local/regional educational environment contributed somewhat to differential assessments of specific course segments and activities. Again, the development and implimentation of the "track system" was undoubtably helpful in responding to the problem of variable needs of workshop participants.

— — — —

APPENDIX A

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING PROJECT EVALUATIONS

WENH -TV-S.V. 21
Title III Project

Directions for Administering Project Evaluations - I

Before the Testing:

This package should contain an adequate number of evaluation booklets so that each teacher in your center may have one. It should also contain the necessary number of answer sheets for those evaluations in which a separate answer sheet is to be used. Check to make sure that you have sufficient materials for your center.

The directions for each evaluation are printed on the cover page of the evaluation booklets. You should read through the directions before each administration period. Make sure the room is well lighted and well ventilated, and is as free as possible from noise, interruptions, and any other possibly disturbing factors as might affect the test administration.

Before you distribute the evaluation materials, make sure that each teacher has a number 2 lead pencil, well-sharpned, with an eraser. Have a small supply of pencils on hand for those who may break their pencils during the testing period. NOTE: Fountain pens, ball point pens or colored pencils ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE;PLEASE USE ONLY PENCILS!

General Directions for Properly Marking the Answer Sheet:

The following general directions for properly marking the separate answer sheets are MOST IMPORTANT; please insist that all workshop participants follow these directions to the letter so that the sheets may be processed and a valid evaluation can be made of the course.

When it is time to begin the testing, say to the teachers:

"Today we would like your reactions to (the Teacher Inventory Questionnaire I-II)(the Review Test based on this television workshop) (the television-instructional unit we have just completed). I shall now pass out the evaluation booklets and materials. The directions for this evaluation are printed on the cover of the booklet; please read the directions while I complete the distribution of the materials. Do not open the booklet until you are told to do so."

Distribute the evaluation booklets (and answer sheets, if applicable). Then say:

"Place the answer sheet on your desk with name grid section to your right. We will first complete certain information needed to identify your answer sheet. Please use only a NUMBER 2 pencil; fountain pens, ball points or colored pencil marks cannot be processed. Make all marks firm and dark. The correct mark is a pencil line confined within but running the length of the printed answer space. DO NOT make X's, circles, dots or slanted marks. If you make an error in marking your answer space, please erase completely the error and make the correction.

First, PRINT your last name, one letter to a box, in the spaces provided at the top of the last name grid section. Then, PRINT your first name in the next series of boxes, one letter to a box, and then your middle initial in the section labeled "MI". Be sure to place only one letter in each box; if your name has more letters than boxes available, simply print as many letters as possible in the available boxes but do not extend your name into the next section.

Next, under each letter box you will find a space for each letter of the alphabet. Go down each vertical column under each letter box and mark the appropriate grid letter corresponding to that letter of your name. Do this for last name, first name and middle initial. Be sure you have marked one and only one grid letter for each letter of your name.

Now move to the lower right section of the identification grid section where it says "Student Number". In the three boxes - starting at the left of this section - PRINT the three digits of your Center Code _ _ _ (provided by the instructor), one digit to a box. Finally, as you did with your name, go down the vertical columns under each digit of the printed Center Code and mark the appropriate number in the space provided. Note that zeros should be treated as any other digit. You should have marked one and only one grid space for each digit of the Center Code."

INSTRUCTORS:

No additional information is required on the answer sheet for either the Teacher Inventory or the Review Test. However, a set of additional information is necessary for the Course Evaluation Surveys (i.e., television lesson evaluations) and are noted below in the section labeled Course Evaluation Survey.

Thus, for the Teacher Inventory and Review Test evaluations, your next instruction to the teachers should be:

"Read carefully the directions on the cover page of the test booklet. (Pause). You are going to record your answers on a standard answer sheet, not in the booklet. Turn the answer sheet so that the completed name grid is at the top."

(Since some teachers may have some basic questions concerning the test or use of the answer sheet, take a few minutes to answer any questions, then say:)

"Now open your test booklet, read the directions, and begin work."

Allow the teachers to work on the evaluation for the prescribed time (Teacher Inventory - no time limit, but a reasonable length of time to complete the items; Review Test - 30 minutes). Then say:

"STOP! Even though you may not have finished the test, put your pencils down. The answer sheets and the test books will now be collected - answer sheets first."

INSTRUCTOR: SPECIAL ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COURSE EVALUATION FORM

A standardized Course Evaluation Survey form has been developed for the WENH-TV Elementary Reading Program for use with your work-session group. This questionnaire has been designed to be applicable to all fifteen lessons of the course and is reusable and should not be discarded. Responses to each lesson must be recorded on a separate answer sheet, one sheet for each lesson.

Please note that specific evaluation dates have been assigned to each lesson. The selected dates should permit the teacher to grasp the content of the TV lesson, the study guide, the work session, and the classroom follow-up prior to the evaluation of each lesson. Insofar as possible, try to present the evaluation on the specified date so that we may have a time-consistent factor between centers.

Before you distribute the evaluation form and answer sheet, make sure that each teacher has a lead pencil, well sharpened, with an eraser. Have a small supply of pencils on hand for emergency use.

When it is time to begin the evaluation, say to the teachers:

> "We would like to have you evaluate the (title of lesson) lesson which we have just completed. The course evaluation is important in that it will provide us with your reactions to the TV lesson, the Study Guide, the Work Session, and the Classroom Follow-up associated with this particular lesson. Your opinions and suggestions will determine the extent to which we must modify the program so that it may become even more meaningful to both teachers and pupils. This evaluation will in no way affect your grade or participation in this class. Rather we are asking for your opinions in order to provide feed-back to those individuals responsible for further development of the Title III project."

Distribute a Course Evaluation Survey form and separate answer sheet to each member of the class. Then, read the general directions for filling out the name grid (See p.1) and the Center Code. (Detailed directions for these tasks appear in the blocked section at the bottom of page 1 and top of page 2 of this instructional manual).

After the teachers have completed the name and Center Code sections, say:

> "Finally, find the section to the left of the "Student Number" section which is headed "1/2/3/4/5/6", and located in the lower left corner of the identification grid. In the first three boxex (1/2/3), PRINT the three digits,one to each box, of the Lesson Code appropriate to this evaluation (_/_/_). The proper code appears at the top of the Course Evaluation Survey form (e.g., the lesson code for Elementary Science Today is "001"). Now, go down the vertical columns under each digit of the printed Lesson Code and mark the appropriate number in the spaces provided. Note that zeros should be treated as any other digit. You should have marked one and only one grid space for each of the three digits of the Lesson Code.
>
> You need not supply any other information."

After the answer sheet identification section has been properly gridded, say:

> "You are to record your opinions on the separate answer sheet. Turn your answer sheet so that the name grid is at the top. Note that there are four sections to the answer sheet (I, II, III, IV). Opinions relative to the Television Lesson must be recorded in Section I; the Study Guide in Section II, etc. When in doubt, simply remember that the item number on the questionnaire should match the itme number on the answer sheet.

We ask that you respond to each item with one of four possible responses-- Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. Since the answer sheet does not use these labels, record your responses according to the following key: (the instructor may wish to post the key on a blackboard) Strongly Agree = 1; Agree = 2; Disagree = 3; Strongly Disagree = 4

If you wish to change your answer, erase your "error" completely and record the new response. There is no time limit for completion of the questionnaire, but try to work rapidly and record your first impression or reaction to the item. Please record an opinion for each item of the questionnaire. Remember we want your HONEST opinion of the course.

Any questions? (Pause) Begin work. "

AFTER THE TESTING: (for ALL evaluations)

1. Collect the answer sheets and verify by count the fact that you have one sheet for each teacher in your class.
2. Collect and retain used evaluation booklets and verify by count that you have one for each teacher in your class.
3. Return answer sheets directly to BERTS, Box Q, Durham, N.H. 03824 on schedule. At the completion of the course, return all materials to BERTS.

WENH-TV/UNH
Teaching Elementary School Reading

Center Codes

Ashland	707
Berlin	709
Claremont	712
Dover #1	756
Dover #2	757
Farmington	718
Franklin	719
Hampton	744
Hopkinton	721
Keene	759
Kittery	723
Lebanon	724
Littleton	726
Manchester #1	727
Manchester #2	767
Nashua	729
Peterborough	733
Portsmouth	734
Salem #1	740
Salem #2	741
Wolfeboro	738

APPENDIX B

TEACHER INVENTORY--PART I

WENH-TV/UNH
Teaching Elementary School Reading

General Directions for the Teacher Inventory

Part I -- Part I of the Teacher Inventory is to be completed by the teacher at the pre-course Orientation Meeting. Items in this section are for general information purposes only and will in no way affect either your grade or presence in the course. Please respond to the items as completely as possible. Record your name and other information requested directly on the teacher inventory booklet. Use the reverse side of the page(s) if you need more room to record your responses to the items.

TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING

TEACHER INVENTORY - PART I

t I of the Teacher Inventory is to be completed by the participant at the pre-course entation Meeting. PLEASE PRINT YOUR RESPONSES. RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS IN THE INVENTORY.

Service Center (e.g., Berlin): ____________________ Instructor: ____________

NAME: ______________________________________ 2. BIRTH DATE: ____________
(last) (first) (m.i.) (mo) (da) (yr)

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE HELD (e.g., B.A., B.S.): ________ 3a. YEAR GRANTED: ________

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTION: ______________________________

UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN READING:

Institution	Course Title	Year Taken

GRADUATE DEGREE HELD (e.g., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.): ________ 6a. YEAR GRANTED: ________

GRADUATE DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTION: ______________________________

POST-GRADUATE ACTIVITY IN READING (e.g., extension courses, summer sessions, NDEA Institutes, seminars, workshops, etc.)

Institution	Course/Program Title	Year Taken

TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE (as of September 1968): ________ years

TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING AT LEVEL(s) SPECIFIED BELOW: (write number of years)

______ (a) Primary Level (K-3)

______ (b) Intermediate Level (4-6)

______ (c) Junior High Level (7-8) in (specify) ____________________ subjects.

______ (d) Senior High Level (9-12) in (specify) ____________________ subjects.

OTHER EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION: (e.g., administration, guidance, department chairman, consultant, etc.)

____

____

. ASSOCIATED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE: (e.g., Head Start, Nursery School, etc.)

____

. PRESENT TEACHING ROLE(s) AND ASSIGNMENT(S): (Complete all that apply)

Teaching Role	Grade(s)	Subject(s)
Substitute	______	______
Teacher	______	______
Supervisor	______	______
Other (Specify) ______	______	______

. IS YOUR CLASSROOM SELF-CONTAINED? (Check one) ______ Yes; No ______

. IF "YES" IN QUESTION 14 ABOVE, COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING; IF "NO" MOVE TO QUESTION 16:

______ (a) Number of pupils in your class;

______ (b) Number of hours per week scheduled for reading instruction;

______ (c) Length (of time) of each reading period.

. ANSWER QUESTIONS a-d BELOW BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE "YES" OR "NO" COLUMN:

Yes	No	Answer each question below with "yes" or "no" check mark
____	____	(a) Does your school have a curriculum guide in reading and/or language arts for the grade(s) you teach?
____	____	(b) Did you participate in the development or revision of this curriculum guide?
____	____	(c) Are you required to follow this guide with your reading classes at the grade level(s) you teach?
____	____	(d) Do you feel that this guide needs further revision at the grade level(s) you teach?

(e) Who developed this guide? ______________________

(f) When was this guide developed or most recently revised? ______________ (year)

DOES YOUR SCHOOL HAVE THE SERVICES OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING PROFESSIONAL READING PERSONNEL? (Check "Yes" or "No" for each type of specialist)

Yes	No	Type of Specialist	
____	____	(a) Remedial Reading Teacher	I Other Specialist-type: (Specify) ______
____	____	(b) Reading Consultant	I
____	____	(c) Reading Coordinator	I ______________________
____	____	(d) Reading Supervisor	I ______________________

E: IF YOU HAVE NOT CHECKED A "YES" FOR ANY OF THE (a-d) SPECIALISTS IN QUESTION 17, SKIP TO ITEM 20 on page 4.

IF YOUR SCHOOL IS SERVED BY A REMEDIAL READING TEACHER, HOW MANY OF YOUR PUPILS DOES SHE WORK WITH? (If number of pupils varies with class and/or grade level, what is the average number of pupils in a given glass?) ______________ pupils

9. PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS BY CHECKING FOR EACH SPECIALIST WHERE APPROPRIAT

Inquiry Statements	Remed.Rdg. Teacher	Reading Consultant	Reading Co-ordinator	Reading Supervi
(a) My classroom is visited on a regularly scheduled basis by:				
(b) I am consulted on an individual basis outside the classroom by:				
(c) At my request, I am able to consult with:				
(d) These services are provided by:				
(1) Teaching reading in group situation (under 10 students):				
(2) Teaching reading in group situation (over 10 students):				
(3) Reading test administration for initial identification:				
(4) Reading test interpretation for initial identification:				
(5) Work on school reading schedule:				
(6) Referrals to school officials (e.g., nurse, speech therapist):				
(7) Conferences with classroom teachers:				
(8) Conferences with parents:				
(9) Curriculum development:				
(10) Report of remedial students on separate report cards:				
(11) Report of remedial students on regular report cards:				
(12) Evaluating test results for remedial cases:				
(13) Follow-up research activities:				

(e) What additional services would you wish to have provided by these reading specialists? (Be specific, and identify specialist-type where appropriate)

0. IF YOUR SCHOOL IS NOT SERVED BY ANY OF THE FOUR TYPES OF READING SPECIALISTS LISTED IN QUESTION 17, PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO QUESTION 21:

Of the reading specialists not serving your school now, which specialist-type would you like to see made available to you ? (Check one or more)

______ (a) Remedial Reading Teacher	Of the four types listed to the left, which ONE would you most like to see made available?
______ (b) Reading Consultant	____ Remedial Rdg. Tchr. Rdg. Coord. ____
______ (c) Reading Coordinator	____ Reading Consultant Rdg. Supvr. ____
______ (d) Reading Supervisor	

What services would you most like to see him (them) provide to you? (Be specific, and identify specialist-type where appropriate)

____

____

____

____

ALL PARTICIPANTS ARE ASKED TO RESPOND TO EACH OF THE REMAINING ITEMS IN THE INVENTORY

1. INDICATE THE PRIMARY SOURCE READING TEXT(S) USED IN YOUR CLASSROOM BELOW; NOTE THAT FOUR "TYPES" OR CATEGORIES OF TEXTX ARE NOTED IN (a) THROUGH (d): (Be specific)

Type and Name of Text	Publisher	Copyright Date
(a) BASAL READERS:		
______	______	______
(b) SKILLS MATERIALS:		
) ______	______	______
______	______	______
(c) PHONICS MATERIALS:		
______	______	______
______	______	______
(d) LITERATURE AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS:		
______	______	______
______	______	______

List any other sources used in your classroom: (Specify as appropriate)

____

____

____

- PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE SPACE TO INDICATE WHETHER THE EQUIPMENT LISTED BELOW IS NOT AVAILABLE AT YOUR SCHOOL, AVAILABLE BUT NOT USUALLY USED, OR AVAILABLE AND USED FOR READING INSTRUCTION: (Check only one response for each equipment-type)

Audio-Visual Equipment	Not Available	Available - Not Used	Used for Rdg. Instruct.
(a) Accelerators			
(b) Controlled Reader			
(c) Films			
(d) Film strips			
(e) Pacer			
(f) Pictures			
(g) Skimmer			
(h) Tachistoscope			
(i) Tapes			

- CHILDREN ENTER THE SCHOOL READING PROGRAM WITH A VARIABLE BACKGROUND OF PRE-SCHOOL EXPERIENCES. PLEASE CHECK THE "ENTRY PROGRAMS" FROM WHICH CHILDREN IN YOUR SCHOOL ARE PHASED INTO YOUR READING PROGRAM: (Check all that apply

______ (a) Head Start Program
______ (b) Nursery/Kindergarten program
______ (c) Transition and/or Articulation
______ (d) Program from home to school
______ (e) Reading Readiness in Kindergarten
______ (f) Grade One entrance by testing
______ (g) Grade One entrance by chronological age
______ (h) Other (Specify): ____________________

Of the above pre-school experiences at entry, the most predominant program is: ________
(letter)

- DESCRIBE YOUR SCHOOL'S INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM IN READING BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE OPTIONS TO EACH ITEM (a) through (c): (Check all that apply)

(a) Methods for grouping students for reading instruction:
    ______ (1) Chronological Age
    ______ (2) Enrichment
    ______ (3) Interests
    ______ (4) Skills Needs

(b) Basic Approach(es) of the instructional program:
    ______ (1) Basal
    ______ (2) Basal and Phonic Supplement
    ______ (3) Individualized Reading
    ______ (4) i.t.a.
    ______ (5) Language Experience
    ______ (6) Linguistics
    ______ (7) Teacher-made Material
    ______ (8) Words-in-Color
    ______ (9) Intensive Phonics
    ______ Other (Specify): ____

(c) Techniques of Diagnosis:
    ______ (1) Informal Structured Diagnosis
    ______ (2) Informal Reading Inventory
    ______ (3) Standardized Tests
    ______ (4) Teacher Observation
    ______ (5) Teacher-made Tests

5. INDICATE YOUR REASONS FOR TAKING THIS COURSE BY CHECKING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS AS APPROPRIATE: (Respond to each item in the series)

Suggested Reason for Enrolling in Course	Very Important	Of Some Importance	Of Little Importance	Not At All Important
(a) Closeness to the Regional Center in my Area				
(b) Personal Interest in Reading				
(c) School policy requirement				
(d) Concern about my ability to teach reading				
(e) Needed for professional Certification				
(f) Program and credits to be applied toward a degree				
(g) Reduced tuition				
(h) Television lessons				
(i) Knowledge of the Regional Instructor				
(j) Other (specify):				

WRITE THE LETTER OF THE REASON LISTED ABOVE THAT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU: ____________

IF YOU HAVE OTHER REASONS FOR TAKING THIS COURSE, PLEASE INDICATE IT (THEM) BELOW SO THAT WE MAY BECOME MORE AWARE OF YOUR NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE COURSE:

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW FOR ANY COMMENTS YOU MAY WISH TO MAKE ABOUT YOUR PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS FOR THE COURSE, SPECIFIC AREAS OF CONCERN IN YOUR OWN READING PROGRAM, OR ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION YOU FEEL IS IMPORTANT TO RELATE AT THIS TIME:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX C

COURSE EVALUATION SURVEY

COURSE EVALUATION SURVEY

Teaching Elementary School Reading

EVALUATION DATE	LESSON CODE	CONTENT TITLE	EVALUATION DATE	LESSON CODE	CONTENT TITLE
Feb. 17	*001*	*Nature of Reading*	*Apr. 28*	*010*	*Extending the Basal Reader*
Feb. 24	*002*	*Factors That Affect Reading*			
Mar. 3	*003*	*Problems That Inhibit Reading*	*May 5*	*011*	*Linguistics and Intensive Reading*
Mar. 10	*004*	*Classroom Diagnosis*			
Mar. 17	*005*	*Individual Diagnosis*	*May 12*	*012*	*Programmed Material*
Mar. 24	*006*	*Classroom Organization*	*May 19*	*013*	*Study Skills*
Mar. 31	*007*	*Individualized Reading*	*May 26*	*014*	*Children's Literature*
Apr. 7	*008*	*Reading Readiness*	*June 2*	*015*	*Review and Summary*
Apr. 14,21	*009*	*Directed Reading Lesson*			

QUESTIONNAIRE: Record on Separate Answer Sheet

A. The Television Lesson (Use Section I on Answer Sheet)

1. The subject matter content was too advanced for the grade I teach.
2. The TV lesson suggested teaching techniques that I will try in my classroom.
3. The lesson was a meaningful introduction to the work session that followed.
4. Filmed classroom segments adequately related concepts of the lesson to my classroom.
5. The length of the filmed segments was appropriate to the content of the lesson.
6. The content of the television lesson was well organized.
7. The content of the television lesson was clearly presented.
8. The television teacher's presentation lacked conviction or authority.
9. This television lesson should be repeated in another year without major revisions.

B. The Study Guide (Use Section II on Answer Sheet)

41. The study guide provided a meaningful introduction to the TV lesson.
42. The discussion questions were pertinent to the general topic of the lesson.
43. Directions for the work session were sufficiently clear and comprehensive.
44. The study guide was an adequate extension of the TV lesson.
45. I plan to use at least one of the bibliographical references noted in the guide.
46. The study guide enabled me to plan follow-up activities for my own class.
47. The study guide for this lesson needs no major revision.

C. The Work Session (Use Section III on Answer Sheet)

81. The purpose of the work session was clear and comprehensive.
82. The work session was well organized and purposeful.
83. The work session made the theoretical content of the lesson more understandable.
84. The work session helped me to apply the theoretical content to my own teaching.
85. Sufficient time was allowed to complete the work session activity.
86. The work session activity needs no major revision for use with my pupils.
87. The work session helped me to plan follow-up activities for my own classroom.
88. Too much time was allowed for completion of the work session activity.
89. This work session activity should be repeated in another year.

D. The Classroom Follow-Up (Use Section IV on Answer Sheet)

121. The follow-up activity developed from this lesson was appropriate and helpful.
122. As a result of this activity, I gained a greater understanding of the reading process.
123. As a result of this activity, I gained a better understanding of how a child learns to read.
124. As a result of this activity, I gained greater insights into the children in my classroom.

-- RETAIN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUBSEQUENT LESSON EVALUATIONS --

APPENDIX D

TEACHER INVENTORY--PART II-B

WENH-TV/UNH

Teaching Elementary School Reading

General Directions
for the

TEACHER INVENTORY--II-B

Part II (Form B) of the Teacher Inventory is to be completed by the teacher and recorded on a separate answer sheet. DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOOKLET in responding to these items. The completed response documents will be sent directly to the Bureau of Educational Research and Testing Services by the regional instructor for processing.

These data are to be used for research purposes only and will in no way affect your grade in this course. We are simply gathering information that could be of assistance in examining the status of elementary reading instruction in New Hampshire and in recommending meaningful improvements.

- - - - -

TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING
Teacher Inventory (II-B)

SECTION A You are asked to rate the importance of each of the following subjects at the grade level you teach. Please use the scale indicated below in recording your ratings on the separate answer sheet. Respond to all items even though you may not teach these subjects or even if these subjects are not included in your curriculum. (Items 1-12)

Scale: 1 = essential
2 = desirable
3 = neither essential nor desirable

1. mathematics
2. handwriting
3. science
4. world cultures
5. art
6. social studies
7. foreign languages
8. physical education
9. music
10 reading
11 drama
12 health

SECTION B You are asked to rate the value of each of the following activities in meeting the goals of an elementary reading program. After reading each of the activities listed below (Items 13-30), record their value--rating each activity by using the rating scale noted below. Mark your response on the separate answer sheet just as you did in the preceding section. Please respond to all items.

Scale: 1 = substantial value
2 = moderate value
3 = little or no value

13. workbooks or worksheets used in the classroom
14. story-telling by teacher
15. providion of material at proper instructional level
16. phonograph records and filmstrips for reading instruction
17. independent reading time
18. experience charts
19. oral or written book reports
20. creative dramatics
21. basal readers
22. creative activities related to reading lesson
23. supplementary readers for guided reading
24. development of study skills (locating information, outlining, etc.)
25. oral reading
26. classroom library
27. individualized reading programs
28. use of diagnostic tests
29. use of linguistic materials
30. directed reading lesson

SECTION C Professional publications have discussed at some length a variety of purposes for the elementary reading program. Below are seven of the most frequently identified purposes. Using the rating scale noted below, indicate how you would rate each of the following goals in your present classroom reading program. (Items 31-37)

Scale: 1 = primary goal
2 = secondary goal
3 = incidental goal

31. To enable children to master a level of reading ability commensurate with their capacity.
32. To enable children to "decode" language, i.e., to recognize ("sound out") new, unfamiliar words.
33. To enable children to develop an increasing ability in independent word attack.
34. To enable children to acquire an increasing understanding of the basic structure of the language.
35. To enable children to develop reading and study skills that will prepare them for more advanced reading assignments in later grades.
36. To enable children to develop a life-long interest in (and love of) reading for its own sake.
37. To enable children to communicate--through spoken and written language--clearly and effectively.

SECTION D Which of the following characteristics do you think would be of value to children in meeting the goals of your classroom reading program? Again, use the scale below in responding to each item in the series. (Items 33-43)

Scale: 1 = substantial value
2 = moderate value
3 = little or no value

38. ability to "sound out" words
39. respect for the rights and opinions of others
40. a variety of outside experiences (travel, family experiences, etc.)
41. self-esteem, self-confidence and self-respect
42. interest in and curiosity about books
43. ability and desire to read independently

SECTION E Listed below are several characteristics which are descriptive of most teachers. Rate the value of each of the following as it applied to a teacher of elementary reading. Please use the rating scale below in responding to each item. (Items 44-56)

Scale: 1 = essential
2 = substantial value
3 = moderate value
4 = irrelevant

44. a sense of humor
45. a knowledge of facts, laws and principles relating to the structure of the language
46. an understanding of how children learn
47. an active curiosity
48. self-reliance, self-confidence
49. a feeling of affection and respect for children
50. a familiarity with various methods of reading instruction
51. the ability to impart information
52. an understanding of the factors that inhibit a child's ability to read
53. an ability to identify an individual child's interests
54. an understanding of howcchildren look at the world in which they live
55. the ability to identify the level of ability of each child
56. the ability to identify the individual needs of each child.

SECTION F Please respond to each of the following items according to the lead question for each sub-group of items. Record your "yes" answer by marking the "1" position on the answer sheet; record "no" by marking the "2" position on the answer sheet. Please respond to all items. (Items 57-71)

I. Are you presently a member of any of the following organizations?

57. NHEA
58. NERA
59. IRA
60. REA
61. NCTE

II. Do you personally subscribe to any of the following publications?

62. The Reading Teacher
63. Elementary English
64. The Instructor
65. Today's Education

III. Are you familiar with any of the professional publications by any of the following reading authorities?

66. Paul McKee
67. Ruth Strang
68. Donald Durrell
69. Nila B. Smith
70. David Russell
71. Arthur Heilman

SECTION G The final series of items deals with statements concerning the teaching of reading in the elementary school. Using the four-point scale noted below, select and mark on your separate answer sheet the category that best describes your reaction to each statement. (Items 72-85)

Scale:
1 = strongly agree
2 = agree slightly
3 = disagree slightly
4 = strongly disagree

72. I am most successful in teaching reading when I follow the instructions provided in the teacher's manual that accompanies our reading series.
73. The time schedule really doesn't make it possible to do an adequate job of teaching reading.
74. I lack sufficient understanding of the learning process and the reading process to individualize my reading program.
75. The services of reading specialists are usually available only to assist the classroom teacher with "problem" cases.
76. Class size makes it extremely difficult to develop an individualized reading program.
77. My major difficulty in teaching reading is unfamiliarity with recent methods and techniques in the teaching of reading.
78. Other subjects suffer because of the undue emphasis on reading instruction in my grade.
79. The average classroom teacher can teach reading better than any other subject in the elementary curriculum.
80. My pupils generally enjoy the reading program in my class.
81. Children should be taught how to "sound out" words as soon as possible.
82. My major difficulty in teaching reading is lack of a variety of materials.
83. I find it difficult to correlate activities in other subject areas with my reading program.
84. To get an accurate picture of her children's needs and abilities, the classroom teacher should mrely almost exclusively on the school's formal testing program.
85. A conscientious classroom teacher should be able to develop a meaningful reading program for her poor readers on her own.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION

APPENDIX E

INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT

EVALUATION REPORT

In-Service Teacher Education Course

Teaching Elementary School Reading

NEW HAMPSHIRE NETWORK
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Evaluation Report Prepared By:

Mary Pine

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,
Title I, P.L. 89-10, as amended

The television course, TEACHING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING, and associated materials have been produced persuant to a grant from the New Hampshire State Department of Education to the New Hampshire Network under provisions of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 89-10, as amended).

However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the N.H. State Department of Education or the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by either agency should be inferred.

The purpose of this report is to present data gathered from both the enrolled teachers ("Participants") and consultants (or "regional instructors") involved in the educational television course A CHILD READS. Two different approaches were used in collecting this information.

I. Teachers ("Participants")

The writer visited 13 of the centers and discussed the course with the teachers. At first she planned to talk with one or two teachers in each center as to their reactions to the course. This approach was used in only two centers, as the writer felt more valid information could be gathered if a larger group of people could be interviewed in each center. Therefore the approach was altered so that writer took approximately 15-20 minutes in each of the remaining centers to discuss the course with the entire group. Using this technique she felt a far better cross-section of teacher opinion was obtained. It also provided an opportunity to clarify any misconceptions on the part of the participants regarding the manual and the television lessons.

At each center, the writer also requested an invitation from any of the teachers to come into their classrooms in order to observe and/or help them with a reading lesson. Unfortunately, only one person granted this permission. One can speculate on the motivation for this reaction but not be sure why it actually occurred. The writer is inclined to think that:

1. Many teachers feel insecure about their ability and performance.
2. They are unaccustomed to having visitors in their classrooms.
3. They are still laboring under the misconception that supervisors are people who come only to criticize.

Whatever the reasoning, this part of the plan was not feasible because of the reluctance of the participating teachers.

II. Consultants ("Regional Instructors")

Three meetings were held with the consultants during the semester. Although the primary purpose of these was to preview and discuss both the tapes and lessons which they would be using, time was also provided for them to share their reactions to lessons previously taught. At the close of the series a general meeting was held. Here full time was devoted to a discussion of the series in its entirety. The consultants were also requested to present their comments and suggestions in written form.

Consultants' Reactions

Upon careful analysis of the innumerable comments presented by the consultants in both their final reports and the discussion groups, the writer decided that it would be best to categorize them on the basis of major topics and present only those which were most frequently mentioned. Naturally since these are indicative of the opinions of the majority, they should be given the most attention and consideration in planning for future presentations of the course.

The topics which will be discussed are:

I General Reactions - Effect on Teachers

II Consultants' Attitude Toward Teachers

III Television Tapes

IV Sequence

V Guide

VI Assignments

I. General Reactions - Effect on Teachers

It is most apparent that the consultants considered the course of decided value for teachers. The most frequently cited reasons which substantiate this generalization are:

1. Students benefitted tremendously.
2. Strong weekly attendance despite adverse travel and weather conditions indicated a most favorable attitude.
3. Teachers thoroughly appreciated the opportunity to get together and share their ideas using a thought-provoking tape as a catalyst.
4. Projects submitted by the teachers in general were excellent.
5. Assignments were submitted weekly with few exceptions. Many were creative and imaginative, frequently equal to the quality of graduate level work.

II. Consultants' Attitude Toward Teachers

It was also interesting to observe a growth in the consultants themselves and in their appreciation of the classroom teachers. This is indicated in such statements as:

1. "Students benefitted tremendously, the consultants even more."
2. "The opportunity to work in this capacity was a worthwhile learning experience for me."
3. "Teachers are wonderful."

The consultants also indicated that they became more aware of the inadequate background in reading instruction of many of the teachers. As a result of this reaction, many of the consultants suggested that the guide be adjusted so that teachers could be treated more on an individualized basis. This approach is consistent with the philosophy of the course itself and with one of the more current theories for regular classroom instruction today. To utilize this approach more effectively, the consultants strongly recommended that classes should be smaller.

III. Television Tapes

General reactions to the telecasts were excellent. It was apparent that the television teacher was enjoyed and, most important, understood. The statement, "He was understandable and talked to the teachers on their level," seems best to summarize the overall reaction.

The consultants felt that in a vast majority of cases, the filmed classroom demonstrations were very useful. The following statements substantiate this viewpoint:

1. They made teaching more alive, interesting and meaningful.
2. The demonstrations were excellent.
3. Real classroom situations were very valuable.

There was a general indication however, of the need to inform the viewers of the grade and/or reading level of the groups in the demonstrations. This, the consultants felt, would better enhance the viewer's understanding of the filmed lesson.

Tapes which the consultants felt were most valuable were:

1. Individualized Instruction
2. Classroom Organization
3. The Directed Reading Lesson
4. The Study Skills
5. Childrens Literature

Tapes which the consultants felt were least helpful were:

1. Linguistics and Programmed Instruction
2. Phonics and Augmented Alphabets
3. Reading Readiness

Major criticisms of these tapes were as follows:

#11 Linguistics and Programmed Instruction

1. Linguistics came across badly. Students were confused and dissatisfied.
2. The lecture on Linguistics could be enlarged.

3. It was difficult for the students to differentiate between an ordinary phonic approach and the approach used in the Linguistic demonstrations.
4. More emphasis should be placed on less expensive and/or teacher made programmed materials.
5. The machines used on the tape were generally unavailable for demonstration in the centers.

#12 Phonics and Augmented Alphabets

1. Devote more time to phonics
2. The demonstrated phonic lesson was poor.
3. Discussion of I.T.A. was not enough for full comprehension.

#8 Reading Readiness

1. The treatment of readiness should not be limited to first grade or pre-school readiness.
2. Readiness should be treated in a developmental manner.
3. As presented, this tape was of value and interest to only a small group of students.

Recommendations

Perhaps the comment, "Cut down on the variety of subject matter and go more in depth" could best be applied to programs 11 and 12.

Consider the possibilities of changing the content of these programs as follows:

Program 11

1. Review the synthetic and analytic phonic approaches as discussed in the preceding lessons.
2. Discuss the history of "phonics vs. look-say" controversy, outlining the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.
3. Discussion and demonstration of intensive phonics lesson.
4. Inclusion of I.T.A. as another widely accepted approach. Compare this, after it is demonstrated and explained with those previously mentioned.

Program 12

1. Utilize a simplified lecture approach.
2. Carefully indicate the differences between the Linguistic approach and the phonic approach.
3. Give more explicit information prior to each demonstration lesson regarding its nature, purpose, and content.
4. Use "voice over" during these demonstrations to clarify and strengthen important points.

In addition to actual content changes in this specific program, it might also be wise to assign background reading in the area of Linguistics before this lesson is shown. This area of study is very new to the students and in fact, to some of the consultants. Readiness for the viewing of this tape is essential for more complete comprehension.

Program 13

This would take the place of the review program and allow more time to fully develop the content included in the original series.

1. Provide a more comprehensive introduction to the film on the Quincy Resource Center.
2. Place greater emphasis on inexpensive and/or teacher made programmed materials.

As a general comment regarding all three of these lessons, it would be extremely helpful to bring as many as possible of these innovative materials to the centers for the students perusal.

Program 8

Some time should be spent in explaining the fact that readiness is an on-going process. It should not be considered as limited to kindergarten and first grade. Perhaps we could take the filmed segment on classification, which is already in the program, and indicate that this is the first step in developing outlining skills. Next we could trace on a chart all the essentials necessary in the development of this refined skill.

IV. Sequence

Although there were occasional suggestions for change in sequence these were not in the majority as only six of the twenty-one consultants made any specific suggestions.

In general the reaction to the original lesson sequence was good. The following statements seem to summarize this point: "As I went over the lesson sequence, it seems that all the lessons are in logical order;" "Good sequence-at first I questioned the arrangement but later saw the purpose of it evolve."

V. Guide

The consultants were strongly in favor of the guide which accompanied the course. They felt it was precise, well organized, and contained an abundance of specific suggestions. Strengths frequently mentioned were:

1. The provision of two approaches for developing their lessons with the students.

2. The value of the detailed glossary.

Among the weaknesses frequently mentioned were:

*1. Directions for assignments sometimes were difficult for the students to handle, particularly those given for the administration of the Informal Reading Inventory.

2. Emphasis on conforming to the course of study, as outlined in the study guide, rather than to the needs of the teachers.

Perhaps we might consider one or more of the following to relieve these problems.

1. Rewrite the directions for the Informal Reading Inventory.
2. Allow time for the consultants to demonstrate the administration of this test.
3. Strongly suggest that each consultant go over these directions with her students in precise detail.
4. Use audio tape of a child being tested by a consultant. Allow students to follow along in the administration of it as a group. Then compare results in a discussion period.
5. More strongly emphasize to the consultants that the guide is not a "Bible" to be followed step by step. They should feel the freedom and responsibility to adapt it to fit individual needs.

No guide, however well done, can possibly predict the individual needs of all those taking the course. It is up to the consultants to recognize the students' needs and adapt the material accordingly.

VI. Assignments

The quantity of responses seems to indicate that this is the area which needs careful revision. In general the comments fell into three categories: time; quantity of work; and specific assignments. Sample remarks include:

Time

*1. The assignments were too time-consuming to be done really well each week.
2. The activity sheets were valuable but I was unable to plan time for group discussion of them.
*3. The assignments were valuable but too time-consuming.

Quantity of work

*1. Assignments were too much for an undergraduate course.
2. Assignments should be fewer in the area of outside reading as well as activities.

* - Students had similar opinions.

Specific Assignments

1. To state one's own philosophy so early in the course **(Lesson #1)** was extremely difficult for the students.
*2. The diagnostic testing assignment should be adjusted.
*3. Readiness activity was not applicable for all.
4. Activity sheets for programs 11 and 12 were not feasible as the materials were not available to the students.

On the other hand, there were very favorable comments regarding the assignments in general. Many consultants felt nothing should be dropped, that the course must make some demands on the students and that all the assignments were beneficial including the reading and projects. How then do we decide what avenue to follow? Perhaps one of the following might be worthy of consideration.

1. Rearrange the time schedule for assignments allowing the students one free week in every four.
2. Provide more time to discuss the activities by "blocking" them in three groups of four weeks each. Discuss them all on the fourth week.
3. Present a list of twenty activities, certain ones of which must be done. Allow the students to select from the remainder of the list. Total to be twelve assignments.

Regarding the comments on specific assignments:

1. Place the activity requiring the statement of one's philosophy of teaching reading further along in the course, so that the students will have enough security and background to successfully perform this task.
2. Test only two children in the Informal Reading Inventory or test one child for word identification and listening as one assignment. Review and discuss in class. Use the same procedure for oral and silent reading. Then give the complete test battery to two children. The results to be evaluated and reported.
3. Eliminate activity sheets for programs 11 and 12.
4. A readiness assignment, useful to all, should be developed once the program is adjusted as previously mentioned.

Students' Reactions

It was interesting to note the high degree of correlation between the comments of the consultants and those of the students regarding their perceptions of the course. Many of the responses of the students were highly personalized and appeared to focus on minute detail. It is particularly striking to observe that student statements dealing with picayune detail were strongest and more predominant in the beginning stages of the course. Data collected from the students in the middle and latter parts of the course were more general and objective in nature. This seems to reflect professional growth and development of a greater sensitivity and understanding of the reading process. It may also suggest an increased degree of adjustment to the rather unusual instructional approach of the course itself. Those comments which corraborate the consultants' views will not be repeated. However, there were several pertinent and relevant reactions which the writer considers worthy of mentioning.

I. Television Tapes

In general the students appeared attentive, alert, and interested while the tapes were being viewed. Their voiced reactions to the tapes were also quite favorable. The two strong points most frequently mentioned were the personality and clarity of the television teacher and the clear organizational pattern of each tape.

Most of the petty comments, referred to earlier in this report, focused on the specific characteristics of individual filmed classroom segments in the television lessons. Such remarks as, "Mrs. Lucas referred to herself by name too frequently," "Mrs. Lito appeared tired," "Mrs. Alexandre spent too much time walking from her classroom to the principal's office," were frequently heard.

Some more important comments were:

1. The vocabulary in some of the programs was hard to follow.
2. Programs were excellent -- prefer more discussion of them.
3. Felt only one point of view was contained in the tapes and wanted a chance to discuss the pros and cons.
4. The value of the program on Linguistics was questionable.
5. Could not understand the Linguistics program.
6. A better description is needed for the Quincy Resource Center.

Recommendations

1. Insist that the consultants review the glossary for each tape prior to its viewing.
2. Prepare and incorporate into each lesson a series of pertinent discussion questions.
3. See Consultants Section for remarks on adaptations of program 11.

II. Demonstrations

In many instances the students felt the filmed classroom segments in the lessons were staged. Much time was spent by the writer in explaining the techniques of filming, describing the classroom settings and the children used in these demonstrations. This objection by the teachers might not have been expressed had we:

1. Given the grade and/or reading level of the children filmed.
2. "Panned" the classrooms (with the camera) more frequently to show that this was a very real situation.

III. Manual and Assignments

The students too, were quite pleased with the manual. Their major complaint was that the directions were weak. Many stated that they thought they understood the directions when they were given in the center but got out into their classrooms alone and were lost. This was particularly true of the Informal Reading Inventory. One person stated that she felt so insecure in the administration of this test that she strongly doubted the validity of her findings.

Once the writer became aware of the fact that this particular assignment had created problems for many teachers, she made a point of checking reactions to this at each center subsequently visited. Without a doubt, this was the weakest of all assignments in the eyes of the students.

Comments about assignments in general included such statements as:

1. There were too many.
2. Some assignments were of little or no value to me.
3. Many were sheer busy work.
4. The reading and project assignments were too much.
5. Most preferred the projects to the outside reading as could actually use them in our classrooms.
6. Being forced to write a synopsis of the reading done and passing it in every week was unnecessary.

It would appear from these remarks that the assignments should be carefully revised so as to provide:

1. Clarity of directions.
2. A more realistic approach to the administration of the Informal Reading Inventory.
3. Build into each assignment a definite carry-over into each teachers' classroom situation.
4. A realistic purpose for the students.

Texts

Students complained almost constantly about the shortage of texts and the fact that those available were not more frequently rotated. Perhaps in the future it might be suggested that each student purchase at least one of several recommended texts before the course actually begins. This should prove to alleviate the problem somewhat.

Concluding Remarks

In general, the writer was quite favorably impressed with the performance of the consultants in each of the centers she visited. There were some rather common weaknesses which she feels we should take steps to remedy.

They include:

1. Lack of or inadequate discussion of the television tapes.
2. Some misunderstanding of the content of the tapes.
3. Infrequent use of the glossary with the students.

The writer suggests that more time be scheduled for the consultants to discuss the content of the tapes in the preview sessions. This should develop a fuller comprehension of the material as well as a better understanding of the philosophy and purpose of the television teacher for each particular lesson.

More emphasis should also be placed not only on the need for a full discussion of the tapes but also on the necessity for enriching the students vocabulary via the glossary.

APPENDIX F

FINAL COURSE EVALUATION

NEW HAMPSHIRE NETWORK

Final Course Evaluation

Education 600
• Teaching Elementary School Reading

TO THE TEACHERS:

We have asked you to give us a week-by-week evaluation of all aspects of our reading course. When these data have been compiled and analyzed, you will have given us a clear picture of what you think of our course. Your reactions will provide us with extremely helpful guidelines for revising and improving the course. We are deeply grateful for your help.

In the enclosed questionnaire we are asking you to give us an overall reaction to the course--as contrasted with the week-by-week reaction you h have been giving us during the semester. We realize that some of the lessons will probably be more distinct in your memory than others. Nevertheless, we would appreciate your honest and as accurate a response as possible.

Please refer to the list of Lessons--noted below--when answering the questions. Also, please resppnd to all items.

#	Lesson Content Title	#	Lesson Content Title
01	*Nature of Reading*	10	*Extending the Basal Reader*
02	*Factors That Affect Reading*	11	*Linguistics and Intensive Reading*
03	*Problems That Inhibit Reading*	12	*Programmed Materials*
04	*Classroom Diagnosis*	13	*Study Skills*
05	*Individual Diagnosis*	14	*Children's Literature*
06	*Classroom Organization*	15	*Review and Summary*
07	*Individualized Reading*		
08	*Reading Readiness*		
09	*Directed Reading Lesson*		

Note: Most item responses will require only reference(s) to Lesson #

- -

NAME ______________________________
last first initial

Course Center Number/Location ________ ____________________
number location

DATA FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY

FCE-1

PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS ON THIS FORM

1. Which television lesson(s) seem to be in most need of revision? (Please be specific about your suggested revisions, if possible.)

2. In general, the TV Lessons (check one)

____ should have been presented in greater detail
____ had just about the right amount of detailed information
____ should have been presented in less detail

3. In general, the pace of the TV Lesson presentations was

____ too slow
____ about right
____ too fast
____ varied from one program to another

4. Program(s) on which the pace of presentation was definitely too fast was(were):
(Lesson #) ______________________________

5. The single TV lesson of the most practical value to me was Lesson # __________ because:

6. The TV lesson of the least practical value to me was Lesson # _______ because:

7. If I were to put the lessons in a different sequence, I would rearrange them in the following sequence (first presentation to last):

8. In general, I would rate the filmed classroom segments in the TV Lessons as follows: (check one response each for a,b,c,and d)

a)
____ too long
____ about right
____ too short

(b)
____ very relevant to the topic
____ moderately relevant
____ irrelevant to the topic

c)
____ gave me practical ideas to use in my classroom
____ was not practical for my classroom

(d)
____ I did not find them believable
____ I found them believable

9. In general, I did (   )like--did not (   )like the filmed classroom segments because: (check one above and specify why):

10. In general, I found the ideas presented in the TV Lessons and the activities in the regional center: (check one)

____ closely related
____ moderately related
____ slightly related
____ not at all related to one another

11. In general, I found the activities at the regional center: (check one)

____ very useful
____ moderately useful
____ very little or no use

12. I would suggest the following changes in the activities of the regional class sessions: (please be specific, if possible)

13. Below are listed four activities that took place at each regional class session. Using the key noted here, please indicate your opinion of each of the activities by circling the appropriate number to the right of the listed activity. Respond to each activity. Next, in the right-hand column, rank order the four activities in order of preference (most preferred to least) by writing the letter associated with the activity according to 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th rank of preference.

(a)	Pre-TV lesson discussion	1	2	3	4	Rank 1st:	____
(b)	Viewing of TV lesson	1	2	3	4	2nd:	____
(c)	Post-lesson (TV) discussion	1	2	3	4	3rd:	____
(d)	Work-study sessions	1	2	3	4	4th:	____

14. The single classroom activity--conducted as a result of this course--that I rate as most successful was related to Lesson # _____. Briefly, this classroom activity consisted of (describe):

15. The single classroom activity assignment that I found LEAST practical or successful was related to Lesson # ________. Briefly, this activity consisted of (describe):

16. In general, I found the study guide:(check one)

____ very helpful
____ moderately helpful
____ very little or no help

17. I would (briefly) describe the following points as the major stremgths and weaknesses of the study guide:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

18. I would suggest the following changes in the study guide: (be as specific as possible)

19. What topics NOT covered in the course would you have liked to have had covered? (Please be specific)

20. Do you have any additional suggestions for the improvement of the course in another year that were not covered by the questions in this brief form?

21. What other personal reactions and comments do you have about the course?

THANK YOU!